

(2)
2.

A
DISCOURSE
OF THE
HOLY EUCHARIST,
IN THE
TWO GREAT POINTS
OF THE
Real Presence
AND THE
Adoration of the Host.

IN
ANSWER to the TWO DISCOURSES
lately Printed at OXFORD on This SUBJECT.

By Dr. Wake.

To which is prefixed
A Large HISTORICAL PREFACE relating
to the same ARGUMENT.

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown
in S. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

PHYSICS

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

T H E
P R E F A C E.

THE nature of the Holy Eucharist is a subject that hath been both so frequently insisted upon, and so fully explain'd in our own and other Languages, that it may well be thought a very needless undertaking for any one to trouble the World with any farther Reflections upon it. For not to mention now those Eminent Men who have heretofore labour'd in this work, nor to run beyond the points that are here designed to be examined; What can be said more evidently to shew the impossibility of the pretended substantial change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ in this Holy Sacrament, than has been done in the late excellent Discourse against Transubstantiation? It is but a very little time since the Adoration of the Host has been shewn not only to be a novel invention, contrary to the practice of all Antiquity, but the danger of it evidently demonstrated, notwithstanding whatever pretences can be made of a good intention to excuse them from the charge and danger of Idolatry, who continue the practice of it. And both these not only still remain unanswered; but if we may be allow'd to judge either

The Preface.

by their own strength, or by our Adversaries silence, are truly and indeed unanswerable.

It is not therefore out of any the least Opinion that anything more need be said to confirm our cause, much less that I esteem myself able to undertake it with the same success that those other Champions of our Faith have done it, that I venture these Discourses to a publick view. But since our Adversaries still continue, without taking notice of any of these things, to cry up their Great Diana no less than if she had never at all been shewn to be but an Idol, I thought it might not be amiss to revive our Instances against it: And that we ought not to appear less solicitous by a frequent repetition of our Reasons, to keep men in the Truth, than others are by a continual insisting upon their so often baffled Sophistry, to lead them into Error.

'Twas an ingenious Apology that Seneca once made, for his often repeating the same things; 'That he did 'but inculcate over and over the same Counsels, to 'those that over and over committed the same faults: And I remember an antient Father has left it as his Opinion, that it was useful for the same truths to be vindicated by many, 'because that one Man's Writings 'might possibly chance to come where the others did 'not; and what was less fully or clearly explain'd by 'one, might be supplied and enlarged by the other. And a greater than either of these, S. Paul, has at once left us both an example and a warrant for this solicitude; Phil. 3. 1. 'To write the same things to you, 'to me (says he) is not grievous, but for you it is 'safe.

Indeed I think if there be any need of an excuse for this undertaking, it ought to be rather to Apologize for a
far

The Preface.

xi

far greater absurdity which we all commit in writing at all against those Men, who in these Disputes concerning the Holy Sacrament, have most evidently shewn that to be true of Christians, which was once said of the antient Philosophers, That there can be nothing so absurd which some Men will not adventure to maintain.

*In most of our other Controversies with those of the Church of Rome, we shew them to be Erroneous; in this they are Extravagant; And as an eminent Pen has very justly express'd it, 'The business of Transubstantiation is not a Controversie of Scrip-
' ture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of downright Impudence against the plain
' meaning of Scripture, and all the sense and reason
' of mankind.*

Discourse
against Tran-
substantiation,
Pag. 2.

*The truth is, as the same Person goes on, 'It is a
' most self-evident falshood: and there is no Do-
'ctrine or Proposition in the World that is of it
' self more evidently true, than Transubstantiation
' is evidently false. And if such things as these
must be disputed, and this Evidence, 'That what we
' see and handle, and taste to be Bread is Bread,
' and not the Body of a Man; and what we see and
' taste to be Wine is Wine, and not Blood, may
' not pass for sufficient without any farther Proof,
' I cannot discern why any Man that hath but
' confidence enough to do so, may not deny any
' thing to be what all the World sees it is, or af-
' firm it to be what all the World sees it is not,
' and this without all possibility of being further
' confuted.*

But

The Preface.

But yet since it has pleased God so far to give over some Men to a spirit of delusion, as not only seriously to believe this themselves, but also rashly to damn all those that cannot believe it with them, we ought as well for the security of those who have not yet abandoned their own sense and reason, in compliance only with others who in this matter profess to have laid aside theirs; as in charity to such deluded Persons as are unhappily led away with these Errors, to shew them their unreasonableness: To convince them that Christianity is a wise and rational Religion: that 'tis a mistaken Piety to suppose that Men ought to believe Contradictions; or that their Faith is ever the more perfect, because the Object of it is impossible: That our Senses ought to be trusted in judging aright of their proper Object; that to deny this is to overthrow the greatest external Evidence we have for our Religion, which is founded upon their judgment; or if that will be more considerable, is to take away all the grounds that even themselves can pretend to, wherefore they should disbelieve them in favour of Transubstantiation.

And this I perswade my self I have in the following Discourse sufficiently shewn, and I shall not need to repeat it again here. For the words themselves, which are the grounds of this great Error, I have taken that Method which seemed to me the most proper to find out the true meaning of them; and, as far as the nature of the Enquiry would permit, have endeavour'd to render it plain and intelligible even to the meanest Capacity. And I have some cause to hope that the most learned will not be dissatisfied with the design, what ever they may be with
the

The Preface.

v

the performance; it being from such that I have taken the greatest part of my Reflections, and in which I pretend to little of my own besides the care of putting together here, what I had observed scattered up and down in parts elsewhere.

It was so much the more fit at this time to insist upon this manner of arguing, in that a late disturber of the Fathers, the better to shew the Antiquity of his new Religion, has pretended to search no less than into the secrets of the Jewish Cabala after it, and to have found out Transubstantiation there amongst the rest of the Rabbinical Follies: Now however the very name of Galatinus be sufficient to Learned Men to make them esteem his Judgment in his Jewish to be much the same as in his Christian Antiquity which follows after, in those eminent pieces of S. Peter's and S. Matthew's Liturgies, S. Andrew's work of the Passion of our Lord; Dionysius's Ecclesiast. Hierarch. &c. yet because such stuff as this may serve to amuse those who are not acquainted with the emptiness of it, I was so much the rather inclined to shew what the true notions of the Jewish Rites would furnish us with to overthrow their pretences; and that the Rabbin Visions are of as little moment to confirm this conceit as their own Miracles.

Consensus Veterum p. 21, &c.

Ibid. p. 27.

But whatever those of the other Communion shall please to judge of my Arguments, yet at least the Opinions of those eminent Men of their own Church may certainly deserve to be considered by them, who have freely declared that there is not in Scripture any evident proof of Transubstantiation; nay some of whom have thought so little engagement upon them either from that or any other Authority to believe it,

B

that

that they have lived and died in their Church without ever embracing of it.

* *Traité d'un
Auteur de la
Communion Ro-
maine touchant
la Transubstan-
tiation.* Lond.
1686.

And of this the late Author of the * Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation, and which is just now set forth in our own Language, may be an eminent instance, being a Person at this day living in the Communion of the Church of Rome, and in no little Esteem among all that know Him. It is not fit to give any more particular character of Him at this time. They who shall please to peruse his Book, will find enough in it to speak in his Advantage; and if they have but any tolerable disposition to receive the truth, will clearly see, that this point of Transubstantiation was the production of a blind and barbarous Age; unknown in the Church for above one thousand Years, and never own'd by the greatest Men in any Ages since. The truth is, if we enquire precisely into this business of Transubstantiation, we shall find the first foundation of it laid in a Cloyster by an unwary Monk about the beginning of the 7th Century: carried on by a Cabal of Men, assembled under the name of a (a) General Council to introduce the worship of Images into the Church, Ann. 787. (b) formed into a better shape by another (c) Monk Ann. 818. and He too opposed by almost all the Learned Men of his Age; and at last confirmed by a (d) Pope of whom their own Authors have left us but a very indifferent (e) character; and in a (f) Synod of which I shall observe only this, that it gave the Pope the power of unmaking Kings, as well as the Priests. that of making their God.

About 636
or 640.

See Blondel
de l'Eucharis-
tie. c. 14. p.
365.

(a) 2. Concil.
Nic.

(b) Blondel. l.
c. cap. 18. pag.
426.

(c) Paschasius
Radbertus.

(d) See the
Treatise of
Transubstanti-
ation; Hist.
of the 9th
Age.

(e) Innocent. III.

Super omnes mortales ambiciosus & superbus, pecunieque pator & satiabilis, & ad omnia scelerata pro premiis datis vel promissis cretus & proclivis. Mart. Paris. (f) Concil. La-
azan. IV. Can. 3. de Herticis.

But

The Preface.

vii

But indeed I think we ought not to charge the Council with either of these Attempts; since, contrary to the manner of proceeding in such Assemblies, received in all Ages, nothing was either judged or debated by the Synod: † The Pope only himself † His omnibus formed the Articles, digested them into Canons, congregatis in suo loco pra- and so read them to the Fathers; some of which, fata, & juxta morem Conciliorum generalem in suis Ordinibus singulis collocatis, factis. their own Historian tells us, approved them, others did not, but however all were forced to be contented with them. capicula LXX

prius ab ipso Papâ exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio que aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa. Matt. Paris. ad Ann. 1215. See this confirmed by Monsieur du Pin. Dissert. VII. Paris. 4^o 1686. pag. 572, 573.

Such was the first rise of this new Doctrine; 1215 years after Christ. But still the most learned Men of that and the following Ages doubted not to dissent from it. (a) Aquinas who wrote about 50 years after this definition, speaks of some, who thought the substantial form of the Bread still to remain after Consecration: (b) Durandus doubted not to assert the continuance of the Matter of the Elements, whatever became of the form; and that 'twas (c) rashness to say that Christ's Body could be there no otherwise than by Transubstantiation: To which (d) Scotus also subscribed, that the truth of the Eucharist might be saved without Transubstantiation, (e) and that in plain terms ours was the easier, and to all appearance the truer interpretation of Christ's words; in which (f) Ockam and (*) d'Alliaco concurr'd with him. (g) Fisher confess'd that there was

(a) See 3. q. 75. Art. 6. Utrum facta consecratione remaneat in Hoc Sacramento forma substantialis Panis?
(b) In. 4. d. 11. q. 9. Quid ergo dicendum de conversione substantiæ Panis in Corpus Christi? Salvo meliori iudicio, potest estimari, quod si in isto Sacramento fiat Conversio substantiæ Panis in Corpus Christi, quod

ipsa sit per Hoc quod corrupti formâ Panis materia eius sit sub formâ Corporis Christi
(c) Id. in 4. dist. 11. q. 3. Art. 14. (d) Scotus in 4. dist. 11. q. 3. (e) Id. 4. sent. d. 11. q. 3. (f) Ockam in 4. q. 5. (*) Alliaco in 4. q. 6. art. 2. (g) Contr. capt. Balyt. cup. 136.

nothing to prove the true presence of Christ's Body and Blood in their Mass: (a) Ferus would not have it inquired into, How Christ's Body is there; and (b) Tostall thought it were better to leave Men to their Liberty of belief in it. Those who in respect to their Churches definition did accept it, yet freely declared that (c) before this Council it was no matter of Faith, nor but for its decision would have been now; That the Ancients did not believe it; that the Scripture does not express it; in short, that the interpretation which we give is altogether as agreeable to the words of Christ, and in truth free from infinite inconveniences with which the other abounds. All which plainly enough shews that not only the late private Heretical Spirit, whose imperious sentiments, and private Glosses, and contradictory interpretations (as a late * Author has elegantly expressed it) like the victorious Rabble of the Fishermen of Naples riding in triumph, and trampling under foot Ecclesiastical Traditions, Decrees, and Constitutions, Ancient Fathers, Ancient Liturgies, the whole Church of Christ, but especially those words of his, This is my Body, has opposed this Doctrine; but even those who are to be supposed to have had the greatest reverence for all these, their own Masters and Doctors, found it difficult to embrace so Absurd and Contradictory a Belief.

And here then let me beseech those into whose hands these Papers may chance to fall, seriously to consider this matter, and whether the sole Authority of such a Pope as Innocent III, whose actions towards one of our own Kings, and in favour of that very ill Man Dominick and his Inquisition, were

(a) Ferus in Matt. 26. Cum certum sit ibi esse Corpus Christi, quid opus est disputare num Patris substantia maneat, vel non?

(b) Lib. 1. de Eucharistia: See the Treatise of Transubstantiation, 1. part.

(c) Vid. Bellarm. de Euch. l. 3. c. 23. p. 767, 768.

Suarez in 3. part. D. Th. vol. 3. disp. 50. p. 593, 594.

Cajetan. in 3. D. Th. q. 75. art. 1. Scotus, l. c. 4. Sent. d. 11. q. 3. Vid. etiam Ockam, Alljac. loc. sup. cit.

* Consensus Veterum Pag. 27.

there nothing else remaining of his Life, might be sufficient to render him detestable to all good Men, ought to be of so great an Authority with us, as to engage us to give up our senses and our reason; nay and even Scripture and Antiquity it self, in obedience to his arbitrary and unwarrantable Definition.

It is I suppose sufficiently evident from what has been before observed, how little assurance their own Authors had, for all the definition of the Council of Lateran, of this Doctrine. I shall not need to say what debates arose among the Divines of the Council of Trent about it. And though since its determination there, Men have not dared so openly to speak their Minds concerning it as before, yet we are not to imagine that they are therefore ever the more convinced of its Truth.

I will not deny but that very great numbers in the Roman Communion, by a profound ignorance and a blind obedience, the two great Gospel perfections with some men, disposed to swallow any thing that the Church shall think fit to require of them, may sincerely profess the belief of this Doctrine; because they have either never at all considered it, or it may be are not capable of comprehending the impossibility of it. Nor shall I be so uncharitable as to suppose that all, even of the learned amongst them, do wilfully profess and act in this matter, against what they believe and know to be true. I will rather persuade my self that some motives or prejudices which I am not able to comprehend, do really blind their eyes, and make them stumble in the brightness of a mid-day light. But yet that all those, who nevertheless continue to live in the external Communion of the Church of Rome, are not thus sincere

sincere in the belief of it, is what I think I may without uncharitableness affirm; and because it will be a matter of great importance to make this appear, especially to those of that Perswasion; I will beg leave to offer such proofs of it as have come to my knowledge, in some of the most eminent Persons of these last Ages, and to which I doubt not but others, better acquainted with these secrets than I can pretend to be, might be able to add many more Examples.

† Petri Picherelli *Expositio Verborum institutionis Cene Domini.* Lugd. Batav. 1629. 12°.

* Hoc est Corpus meum, i. e. Hic panis fractus est Corpus meum. pag. 10. Hoc est Corpus meum, i. e. Panis quem frangimus est communio cum Corpore Christi. pag. 14. — and pag. 27. Expounding Gratian. dist. 2. Can. Non Hoc Corpus, Ipsum Corpus invisibiliter, de vero & germano Corpore in Calis agente intelligitur: Non ipsum visibiliter de Corpore & sanguine Sacramentalibus, Pane & Vino; Corporis Christi & sanguinis symbolis: Quæ rei quam significant nomen per suam prædictam metonymiam mutantur.

And the first that I shall mention is the famous † Picherellus, of whom the testimonies prefix'd to his Works speak so advantageously, that I shall not need say any thing of the esteem which the learned World had of him.

** I must transcribe his whole Treatise should I insist on all he has delivered repugnant to their Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Suffice it to observe that in his Exposition of the words of Institution, This is my Body, He gives this plain interpretation of them, This Bread is my Body which is both freely al-*

lowed by the Papists themselves to be inconsistent with their belief as to this matter; and which he largely shews not only to be his own, but to have been the constant Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers in this point.

But in this it may be there is not so much ground for our admiration, that one who was not very fond of any of the Errors of that Church, should openly dissent from her in this: It will more be wondred that a person so eminent amongst them as Cardinal du Perron, and that has written so much in defence of

of Transubstantiation, should nevertheless all the while Himself believe nothing of it. And yet this we are assured he freely confess'd to some of his Friends not long before his death: That he thought the Doctrine to be Monstrous; that He had done his endeavour to colour it over the best He could in his Books; but that in short he had undertaken an ill cause, and which was not to be maintain'd. But I will set down the relation as I find it in Monsieur Drelincourt's * Answer to the Landgrave of Hesse; and who would not have presum'd to have offer'd a relation so considerable, and to a person of such Quality, had he at all fear'd that he could have been disproved in it. † Your Highness (says He) may believe me if you please: But I can assure you with all sincerity and truth that if the late Cardinal du Perron has convinced you of the Truth of Transubstantiation, he has convinced you of that of which he could never convince himself, nor did he ever believe it. For I have been informed by certain Persons of Honour, and that are in all respects worthy of belief, and who had it from those that were eye witnesses; That some friends of that Illustrious and Learned Cardinal who went to see him as he lay languishing upon his Bed, and ill of that distemper of which he died, desired him to tell them freely, what he thought of Transubstantiation: To whom he answer'd, That 'twas a MONSTER. And when they farther ask'd him, How then he had written

* Réponse à la Lettre de Monsieur le Prince Ernest aus cinq Ministres de Paris, &c. Genève 1664.

† Votre Altesse me croira s'il luy plaît. Mais je luy puis dire avec toute sincérité & vérité, que si le défunt Cardinal du Perron luy a persuadé la Transubstantiation, il luy a persuadé ce qu'il n'a pu se persuader à soy-même, & qu'il n'a nullement cru. Car je scay par des Gens d'Honneur & dignes de foy, qui l'avoient appris

de temoins oculaires, que des Amis de cet illustre & sçavant Cardinal, qui l'estoient allés visiter lors qu'il estoit languissant en son lit, & malade de la maladie dont il est mort, le prièrent de leur dire franchement ce qu'il croyoit de la Transubstantiation, & qu'il répondit, qu'il la tenoit pour un MONSTRE. Et comme ils luy demanderent, comment donc il en avoit écrit si amplement & si doctement; il repliqua, qu'il avoit de ployé toutes les Adresses de son Esprit pour colourer cet abus, & pour le rendre plausible; & qu'il avoit fait comme ceux qui sont tous leurs Efforts pour defendre une mauvaise Cause.

'so copiously and learnedly about it? He replied, That he had done the utmost that his Wit and Parts had enabled him, to COLOUR OVER THIS ABUSE and RENDER IT PLAUSIBLE; But that he had done like those who employ all their force to defend an ILL CAUSE. And thus far Monsieur Drelincourt. I could to this add some farther circumstances which I have learnt of this matter, but what is here said may suffice to shew what the real Opinion of this great Cardinal, after all his Voluminous Writings, as to this Doctrine was; unless some future Obligations shall perhaps engage me to enter on a more particular account of it.

To these two great instances of another Nation I will beg leave to subjoin a third of our own Country: Father Barnes the Benedictine, who in his *Pacific Discourse of most of the points in Controversie between us and the Papists*, expressly declares, 'That the Assertion of Transubstantiation, or of the substantial change of the Bread, though it be indeed the more common Opinion, is yet no part of the Churches Faith: And that the Scripture and Fathers, when they speak of a *mutatio* may be sufficiently Expounded of that admirable and supernatural change of the Bread, by the presence of Christ's Body added to it, without the departure of the substance of the Bread it self.

Catholico-Romano-Pacificus
OXON. 1680.
Pag. 90. Assertio Transubstantiationis seu mutationis substantiatæ panis, licet sit opinio communior, non tamen est fides Ecclesiæ. Et Scripturæ & Patris docentes utitur, sufficienter exponi possunt de admirandæ & supernaturalis mutatione Panis per Presentiam Corporis Christi ei accedentem, sine substantialis Panis destructione. Et. P. 95. Metuimus illam in Augustissimo Sacramento factam, plerique graves & antiqui Scriptores ita explicant, ut non fiat per destructionem substantiæ panis, sed per receptionem supernaturalis substantiæ Corporis Christi in substantiam Panis. V. pl.

It appears by these words how little this Monk thought Transubstantiation an Article of Faith. But a greater than he, and who not only did not esteem it necessary

necessary for Others, to receive it, but clearly, shews that he did not believe it himself, is the Illustrious Monsieur de Marca, late Archbishop of Paris, and well known to the World for his great Learning and Eminence. His Treatise of the Eucharist was publish'd with Authority, by one of his near Relations the Abbé Faget at Paris 1668. with some other little Tracts which he had received from the Archbishops own hands. In the close of that Treatise he thus delivers his Opinion: '† The species of the Bread is 'in its Essence and Nature distinct from the Body 'of Christ adjoyn'd to it, although the reason of 'the Eucharist requires that the inward substance 'of the Bread should be converted into that Body 'after a manner that exceeds all Imagination. But 'yet this change hinders not but that the BREAD 'which is seen still RETAINS its own NATURE, 'BEING, and ESSENCE, or SUBSTANCE, together with the proprieties of its true Nature, 'among which one is the faculty of nourishing our 'Bodies, &c. Whence it follows that it was rightly 'observ'd by *Gelasius*, that the Sacrament of the 'Body and Blood of Christ was a *Divine thing*, 'because the Bread and Wine being perfected by

*Ita tñ. atq;
Reverend P. de
Marca Parisi-
ens. Archiep.
Dissertationes
Posthumæ.
De Sanctissima
Eucharistie
Sacramento
dissertatio, in
fne.
† Species Panis
est Essentia &
Natura distin-
cta à Corpore
Christi sibi
adjuncto, licet
ratio Eucharis-
tiæ id exigat,
ut substantia
Panis interior
conversa fuerit
in illud Cor-
pus modo qua-
dam qui omnem
cogitationem
exsuperat. Cæ-
terum mutatio
illa non officit
quin Panis,
qui videtur,
[id est, Ac-
cidentia] suam*

Naturam, Extantiam & Essentiam [SIVE SUBSTANTIAM] retineat, & nature vere Proprietates, inter quas est alendi corporis humani facultas—. Unde consequitur rectè observatum à *Gelasio* Sacramenta Corporis & Sanguinis Christi divinam rem esse, quia Panis & Vinum in divinam transiunt substantiam, S. spiritu perficiente, nempe in Corpus Christi spiritale: sed ex alia parte non desinere substantiam & naturam Panis & Vini, sed ea permanere in suæ proprietate Naturæ. Quoniam scilicet postquam Panis in divinam substantiam transiit, [NON INTERIIT INTEGRA PANIS NATURA QUAM SUBSTANTIAM QUOQUE VOCAT, NEC DESIVIT: SED] in suæ proprietate Naturæ permansit ad alendum Corpus idonea, quod est præcipuum consellii panis munus. Note, That in the Paris Edition, they have put in those words printed in the Black Letter (*id est, Accidentia*) and omitted those that I have caused to be set in Capitals: But in the Original leaf, which I have left in *S. Martin's* Library to be seen by any that pleases, and which was cut out for the sake of this passage, it stands as I have said: and as it is truly represented in the *Holland Edition*.

'the *Holy Spirit* pass into the *Divine Substance*,
'viz. the *spiritual Body of Christ*; but on the other
'side, that the *SUBSTANCE* and *NATURE* of the
'*BREAD* and *WINE* do not cease to be, but continue
'still in the *propriety* of their own *Nature*.

* Baluze 2

Lettre à Mon-
sieur le Presid.

Marca. S'il est
vray, ce que

J'ay de la peine
à croire, que

seu Monfig-
neur ait com-

posé les Trait-
tez que M.

Faget a fait
imprimer sous

son nom, dont
il se vante

dans la Preface
et dans la Vie

d'avoir les O-
riginaux écrits

de la main
de l'Auteur,

nous ne scaurions empêcher que seu Monseigneur ne passe dans l'Esprit de beaucoup de Gens pour

HERETIQUE, au sujet de l'Eucharistie.

And here I suppose any one who reads this passage alone of this Treatise might without the help of * Monsieur Baluze's Animadversion easily have concluded, 'That if this be indeed the work of 'Monsieur de Marca, 'twill be impossible to hinder 'him from passing with many Persons for a 'HERETICK as to the point of the Eucharist. But before I quit this Instance, I cannot but observe with reference to this Treatise, what care the Romanists take to hinder the sentiments of learned Men in this Point from coming to a publick knowledge: And which might give us some cause to suspect, that their great concern is not so much whether they do indeed believe Transubstantiation themselves, as not to let the World know that they do not.

* Defense of
the Exposition
of the Do-
ctrine of the
Church of Engl.
Appendix, p.
127. n. v.

This has been heretofore shewn in another Treatise with reference to S. Chrysostom; whose * Epistle to Cæsarius some of the Sorbonne Doctors caused most shamefully to be cut out of Monsieur Bigot's Edition of Palladius, because it too plainly spoke the Doctrine of the Protestants as to this point. And the same has almost happened to this Treatise of Monsieur de Marca here mentioned: † Before it came to a publick sight, the passages that seemed most visibly to op-

† See the Preface to the Reader before the same Edition of the same Treatises 12^o Anno 1669. and Monsieur Baluze's Letter to the Bishop of Tulle on this occasion. p. 5.

The Preface.

XV

pose their Doctrine, were either changed or suppressed; * (of which the passage before cited is one). as appears by the Paris Edition now extant of them. But † the Providence of God that brought to light the other, has discover'd this cheat too; For before the alarm was given, and that the Chancellor, (a) the Sorbonne Doctors, but especially Monsieur Baluze by his Letters to the President de Marca, the Archbishop's Son, upon this occasion, had awakened the Abbé Faget to consider more nearly what he had done; (b) several Presents had been made of the intire work as it was in the Authors MS. ; and, if we may credit their own relations, the Printer who was a Protestant and the same that printed (c) Monsieur Claude's Books against the Perpetuité, had obliged that learned Person with a Copy; by which means both the genuine sentiments of Monsieur de Marca in opposition to Transubstantiation are preserved, and their fraudulent endeavours to suppress his opinion discovered.

* The Original leaves cut out by them having fallen into my Hands, may be seen by those that desire it in S. Martin's Library.

† See Monsieur Baluze 2. Lettre pag. 15.

(a) Mais enfin le refus que Mrs. de Sorbonne luy ont fait de luy donner leur approbation— luy ont fait ouvrir les yeux, s'estant laissé entendre, quoy qu'un peu tard, qu'il a fait une sottise. ibid. (b) Et p. 16. Je dis, un peu tard; parce

qu'il avoit de j'a fait des présentes de son livre, & que le libraire en avoit aussi débité quelques uns, (c) Baluze Lettre à Monsieur l'Evesque de Tulle, p. 5.

To this eminent Person I will beg leave to subjoin a fifth, and he too no less known to the World both for his Learning and Reputation, nor less a Heretick in this point, however not hitherto so openly discovered as the other: and that is Father Sirmond the Jesuit. In his life of Paschasius Radbertus, he tells us, That this Monk was the first who explained the genuine sense of the Catholic Church in this mystery: and indeed if what * Blondel and some others have observed concerning him be true, that it was for Impanation, not Tran-

Sirmond. Vit. Pasch. Radbert.

* Eclaircissement de l'Euch. c. 19. p. 431, &c.

substantiation; the Jesuit perhaps spoke his real judgment of him, though not in that sense that he is usually understood to have done it.

But however that be, certain it is that this learned Father so little believed the Doctrine of the present Roman Church as to this point, that he freely confess'd he thought it had herein departed from the ancient Faith; and at the desire of one of his Friends wrote a short Treatise to confirm his Assertion. This though it be not yet made publick, is nevertheless in the hands of several Persons of undoubted integrity: I will mention only one, whose learning and worth are sufficiently known to the World, viz. Monsieur Bigot: who discoursing with Father Raynault at Lyons about this matter, the Jesuit confess'd to him that it was true, that he had himself a copy of his Treatise which he would communicate to him, and that it was Father Sirmond whom upon this account he reflected upon in his Book, de bonis & malis Libris, where he observes, 'That Men of great parts love to innovate, and invent always somewhat of their own: in difficult matters.

Ingenia præclara in rebus difficilibus aliquid semper de suo communi-

santur. Nam

præclara ingenia multa novant circa scientias. Throph. Raynaud's S. J. Erotemata de malis ac bonis libris: Lugduni 1653. p. 251.

When Monsieur Bigot return'd to claim the performance of his promise, the Jesuit excused himself to him that he could not light upon it; which when he afterwards told to Father Chiflet another Jesuit of Dijonois, he again confirm'd to him the truth of the relation, and voluntarily offer'd him a Copy of the Treatise, which he told him was transcribed from Father Sirmonds Original. This Monsieur

ſieur Bigot has not only acknowledged to ſome of his Friends of my acquaintance, but promiſed to communicate to them the very Treatiſe; and I dare appeal to the candor of that worthy Perſon for the truth of what I have here related, and whoſe name I ſhould not have mentioned, but only to remove all reaſonable cauſe of ſuſpicion in a matter of ſuch importance.

And what I have now ſaid of Father Sirmond, I might as truly affirm of a fourth Perſon of as great a name, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, whoſe Treatiſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation has been ſeen by ſeveral perſons, and is ſtill read in the MS. But becauſe I am not at liberty to make uſe of their names, I ſhall not any further inſiſt upon this example.

My next inſtance will be more undeniable, and it is of the ingenious Monſieur de Marolles Abbot of Ville-loyn, well known in France for his excellent Writings and great Abilities. A little before his death, which happen'd about the beginning of the Year 1681. being deſirous to free his Conſcience as to the point of the Holy Eucharift, in which he ſuppoſed their Church to have many ways departed from the right Faith, he cauſed a Paper to be Printed, in which he declares his thoughts concerning it; and ſent it to ſeveral of his moſt learned Acquaintance, the better to undeceive them in this matter. One of theſe Perſons, to whom this Preſent was made, having been pleaſed to communicate to me the very Paper which by the Abbot's order was brought to him, it may not perhaps be amiſs to gratiſie the Reader's curioſity, if I here inſert it at its full length.

* Permiſſion.

* The Abbot means, that now at his death he hoped he might speak freely what he durst not in his Life-time do.

* *Permission hoped for to speak freely for the Truth.*

I Cannot but exceedingly wonder that a certain Preacher, who reads the Holy Scriptures, and will maintain nothing but by their Authority, should nevertheless undertake to defend against all Opposers by the Scriptures, the Real Presence in the Eucharist out of the act of receiving; and think himself so sure to overcome in this Occasion, as to talk of it as a thing certain, and in which he knows he cannot be resisted.

‘It would certainly be more safe not to be too much prepossessed with any thing. I will not name the Person, because I have no mind to displease him; But in the mean time, neither Sense, nor Reason, nor the Word of God have suggested to him one word of it; unless the Apostle was mistaken when he said, *‘If ye are risen with Christ, seek those things that are above, where Christ is seated at the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above and not on things upon the Earth. Coloss. 3. 1, 2.* For how could he speak after this manner, if Jesus Christ be still upon Earth by his real Presence under the species in the Eucharist?

‘When he ascended into Heaven, he said not to his Disciples which saw his wonderful Ascension;

' sion ; I shall be with you always by my Real Presence
 ' under the species of the Eucharist, which shall be pub-
 ' licly exposed to you. In his Sermon at the Sup-
 ' per which he had just now celebrated, and which
 ' immediately preceded his *Passion*, Jesus Christ
 ' according to S. *John* says expressly to his Apostles,
 ' that he was about to leave them, that he should
 ' not be long absent, that he would send to them
 ' the *Comforter* ; but not one word of his *Real*
 ' *Presence in the Eucharist*, which he had so late-
 ' ly instituted under the *Bread and Wine*, to be
 ' a Mystery of our Faith for the nourishment
 ' of the *Soul to life Eternal*, as ordinary *Bread*
 ' and *Wine* are for the nourishment of the *Body* to
 ' a *temporal Life*, and that too for ALL the faithful,
 ' as is clearly signified by those Words, *Drink ye*
 ' *all of this*. Whereupon I have elsewhere remark'd
 ' the custom of *Libations* which were in use time
 ' out of mind throughout the whole *Roman Em-*
 ' *pire*, and which custom was establish'd in ho-
 ' nour of the gods : As may be seen in the Version
 ' of *Athenaus* in 1680 ; and as I had observed long
 ' before upon *Virgil* and *Horace*, though there was
 ' but little notice taken of it. Which makes me
 ' think it very probable, that our Saviour intend-
 ' ed to sanctifie this Profane custom, as he did
 ' some others, which I have remarked in the same
 ' place.

' When Men undertake to prove too much, they
 ' very often prove nothing at all : To maintain
 ' that *Jesus Christ* is intire in the *Eucharist* with
 ' all his Bodily extension, and all his Dignity, so
 ' as he is in Heaven ; so that under the *Roundness*
 ' of the *Bread* there is nothing that is *Round* ;
 ' under

The Preface.

'under the *Whiteness* there is nothing *White*; this
 'is what the Scripture has not said one word of.
 'They are indeed meer *Visions*, and which are not
 'so easie to maintain as Men may think. The
 'Priest who celebrates breaks the *Host* in three
 'pieces; One of these he puts into the Cup, of
 'the two others he communicates, in memory as
 'tis plain of what we read, That *Jesus the night*
 '*in which he was betray'd took Bread, and when*
 '*he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take,*
 '*Eat, This is my Body which is broken for you, Do*
 '*this in Remembrance of Me.* 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24. In the
 'Mass there is here no more *Bread*, they are only
 'the *appearances of Bread*, that is to say, the *Ac-*
 '*cidents*, and which are not tied to any *Substance*.
 'And yet so long as there is but one *Atom* of
 'those *Accidents* which they call *Eucharistical species*
 'in the *Consecration* that has been made, the *true*
 '*Flesh* of the Lord Jesus is so annex'd to them,
 'that it remains there whole and intire, without
 'the least confusion, and may be so in diverse places
 'at the same time. I doubt not but those who
 'teach us this Doctrine have thought of it more
 'than once; but have they well consider'd it? for
 'there is not one word of it in all the *Sacred*
 '*Writings*.

'Is it nothing that *Jesus Christ* said to his A-
 'postles but a little while before his *Passion*, when
 'he was now about to celebrate his Holy Supper
 'with them, *You shall have the Poor always with*
 '*you, but me ye shall not have always,* Matth. 26.
 '11. His *Real Presence* in the *Eucharist*, out of
 'the act of communicating, not excepted?

'They

‘They say to the People, Behold your Creator
 ‘that made Heaven and Earth : And the People see-
 ‘ing the consecrated Bread in the *Ciboire* wherein ’tis
 ‘carry’d abroad, says, Behold the good God going
 ‘in procession to confound the *Hereticks* : and ac-
 ‘cording to their natural inclination, they a-
 ‘dore with all their Hearts they know not what,
 ‘because so they have been instructed ; and the
 ‘better to maintain their prejudice intire in this
 ‘matter, they become mad : But alas ! they know not
 ‘what they do, and we ought to pity their
 ‘Excess.

‘On the other side, who can tell whether the
 ‘Priest has *consecrated*, or indeed whether he be
 ‘capable of *consecrating* ? Is it a point of Faith
 ‘to believe, that among so many Priests, no one
 ‘of them is a *Cheat* and an *Impostor* ? This cer-
 ‘tainly cannot be of Faith ; and if this be not,
 ‘neither is that which exposed with so much Pomp,
 ‘to carry the true Body of the Lord through the
 ‘Streets, of Faith. Thus the belief is at best but
 ‘*Conjecture* ; and then whatsoever in such cases is
 ‘not of Faith is sin, according to the Apostle,
Rom. 14. 23.

‘I know not what colour can be sufficient to
 ‘excuse so strong an Objection, unless Men will
 ‘absolutely resist the Holy Scripture, and right
 ‘Reason founded upon it.

‘’Tis further said, that Jesus Christ is in ma-
 ‘ny places at the same time, in the *Hosts* which
 ‘are carried in very different manners ; But neither
 ‘for this is there any Text of Scripture. You will
 ‘say, this may be ; I answer, the Question here
 ‘is not of the Infinite power of Jesus Christ, but
 D ‘of

' of his Will, and which we must obey when it is
 ' known to us ; and of this as to the present point
 ' we read nothing in the Holy Scripture. The
 ' shorter way then would be to say, that the Sa-
 ' crament of one Parish is not the same with that
 ' of another, although both the one and the other
 ' concur in the same design to worship God ; as
 ' the Paschal Lamb of one Family, was not the
 ' Lamb of another, although both the one and the
 ' other were to accomplish the same Mystery.
 ' Thus for instance, on *Corpus Christi-day*, the Sa-
 ' crament of *S. Germain d' Auxerrois*, where the
 ' perpetual Vicar consecrates the Host, and *Monsieur*
 ' the Dean, the first *Curé*, carries it the Procession
 ' under a rich Canopy crown'd with Flowers, this
 ' Host is not the same with that of *S. Paul's* which
 ' is carried after another manner, *viz.* the Image
 ' of that Apostle made of Silver gilt, falling from
 ' his Horse at his Conversion, under the Sacra-
 ' ment of Jesus Christ hung up in rays of Gold;
 ' and carried under the covering of another state-
 ' ly Canopy ; and so of all the other Churches.

' As for the stories of several *Hosts* that have
 ' been stabb'd with Penknives, and have bled, they
 ' serve only to bring in some superstition contrary
 ' to the word of God, which never pretended that
 ' there was material *Blood* in the consecrated
 ' Bread, because it is the *Body* of Jesus Christ in
 ' a mystery of Faith.

' For what is said of an *Infant* that was seen in
 ' the stead of the *Host*, and of the figure of Christ
 ' sitting upon a *Sepulchre* instead of the same
 ' *Host*, are meer *Fables* suggested by the *Father*
 ' of Lies.

' It

‘It is further reported of certain Robbers that
 ‘carrying away the Vessel in which the *Host* is
 ‘kept, they have thrown the *Host* it self upon
 ‘the ground, and trampled it under foot, some-
 ‘times have cast it into nasty places, without any
 ‘fear that it should avenge it self ; This is a most
 ‘horrible thought, and of which we ought not to
 ‘open our mouths, but only to detest so dreadful
 ‘a profanation.

‘The same must be said of those *Hosts* which
 ‘have been cast up, as soon as received, whether
 ‘by sick persons, or sometimes by debauched Priests,
 ‘disordered with the last nights intemperance ; both
 ‘which have sometimes happened, not to say any
 ‘thing of those other terrible inconveniences, re-
 ‘mark’d in the Cautions concerning the *Mafs*. All
 ‘which shew that Men have carry’d things too
 ‘far, without any warrant from the Word of
 ‘God.

‘It is not therefore so easie, as some imagine,
 ‘to maintain the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*
 ‘out of the Use, against the Opinions of any Op-
 ‘poser.

‘In the mean time the Truth is terribly obscured,
 ‘and few give themselves the trouble to clear it.
 ‘On the contrary it seems that among the many
 ‘Writers of the Age, there are some who make it
 ‘their whole business to hide it, and to keep them-
 ‘selves from finding it out, as if they desired never to
 ‘be wiser than they are. The vanity of lying flat-
 ‘ters them but too much in all the Humane passions
 ‘which sway them.

‘There are nevertheless some faithful Disciples,
 ‘and Apostolick Souls who are exempted, to obey

* Li. 4.

‘ God by his Grace, and to give glory to his Name.
 ‘ It was not long before his departure that *David*
 ‘ said, *Every man is a liar* : Psal. 115. 2. and *S. Paul*
 ‘ to the *Romans* 3. 4. to show that God only is true,
 ‘ adds immediately after from *Psalms* 50. 6. *Thou*
 ‘ *mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear*
 ‘ *when thou judgest.*

Such was the Opinion of Monsieur de Marolles
as to this point: I should too much trespass upon the
Reader's patience to insist thus particularly upon others
of lesser note. The Author of the late Historical
Treatise of Transubstantiation, has fully shewn not
only his own Opinion, but the Tradition of all the
Agés of the Church against it: And though I dare
not say the same of whoever he was that set forth
the † Moyens surs & Honnestes, &c. that he did
not believe Transubstantiation himself, yet this is
clear, ‘ That he did not desire any one should be
 ‘ forced to believe it; or indeed be encouraged
 ‘ to search too nicely into the manner how Christ is
 ‘ Present and Eaten in the Holy Sacrament.

† Il nous suffit
 que J. C. qui
 est la Verité
 même nous ait
 assuré que ce
 Sacrament est
 véritablement
 son Corps, &
 qu'il ait or-
 donné de manger

sa chair & boire son sang : car il faut absolument qu'il y soit, puis qu'il nous ordonne de l'y
 manger, sans s'embarrasser l'Esprit de quelle manière & comment cela se fait 2. Part, p. 102.

Whether Monsieur de Meaux believes this Do-
ctrine or not, his authority is become of so little im-
portance, that I do not think it worth the while to
*examine. Yet the first French * Answer to his Ex-*
position observes, that in the suppress'd Edition of

* Advertisse-
 ment n. 14.

p. 22. Mr. B.--
 Speaking of

that Edition, Il n'y avoit en aucun lieu de l'Article, ni le terme de *Transubstantiation*, ni
 cette proposition, que ‘ le pain & le vin sont changez au corps & au sang de J. C. dans
 ‘ la dernière [Edition] après ces mots, le propre Corps & le propre sang de J. C. il a
 ‘ ajoute auxquelles le pain & le vin sont changez; cest ce qu'on appelle *Transubstantiation*.

it he had not at all mentioned 'that the Bread and 'Wine are turned into the Body and Blood of Christ; those words in the close of that Paragraph which we now read, viz. 'that the Bread and the Wine are 'changed into the proper Body, and proper 'Blood of Jesus Christ, and that this is that 'which is called Transubstantiation, being put in; † for the greater neatness of the Discourse and Stile, since.

† *Monsieur de Meaux* Letter of his alterations; *Vind.* p. 13. & 117. pour l'ordre, & pour une plus grande netteté du discours & du style.

*But now for his Vindicator, 'tis evident, if he understands his own meaning, that he is not very well instructed about it. * 'It is manifest, says he, that 'our dispute with Protestants is not about the 'manner, How Jesus Christ is Present, but only about 'the Thing it self, whether the Body and Blood 'of Jesus Christ be truly, really, and substantially present after the words of Consecration, 'under the species or Appearance of Bread and 'Wine, the substance of Bread and Wine being not 'so present.*

* *Vindication of the Bishop of Condom's Expof. Pag. 83.*

In which words, if his meaning be to exclude totally the 'manner, How Jesus Christ becomes present in the Eucharist, as his expression is, from being a matter of Faith, it might well have been ranged amongst the rest of their new Popery 1686. But if he designs not to exclude the manner of Christ's Presence, but only the mode of the Conversion, as he seems by some other of his words to insinuate, viz. whether it be by Adduction, &c. from being a matter of Faith, he ought not then to have deny'd the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, which their Church has absolutely defined to be by that wonderful and singular Conversion so aptly called Transubstantiation; but more precisely to have explain'd his School-nicety

nicety, and which is altogether as unintelligible, as the Mystery which 'tis brought to explain.

I might to the particulars hitherto mentioned, add the whole Sect of their new Philosophers, who following the Hypothesis of their Master Des-cartes, that Accidents are nothing else but the Modes of Matter, must here either renounce his Doctrine or their Churches Belief. But I shall close these remarks, which have already run to a greater length than I designed, with one instance more, from a Prelate of our own Church, but yet whose truly Christian sincerity will I am persuaded justify him even to those of the Roman Communion: and it is the learned Archbishop Usher, who having been so happy as to convert several Roman Priests from their errors, and inquiring diligently of them, what they who said Mass every day, and were not obliged to confess Venial Sins, could have to trouble their Confessors so continually withal; ingenuously acknowledged to him, that the chiefest part of their constant Confession was their Infidelity as to the point of Transubstantiation, and for which as was most fit, they mutually quitted and absolved one another.

The same is affirmed by Monsieur du Moulin of several Priests in France: Disp. Sedanens. de Sacram. Euch. par. 4. p. 846. Nec abs re de intentione presbyteri dubitatur, cum plurimi Sacerdotes canant Missam reluctante Conscientia, quales multos vidimus qui ejurato Papismo fatebantur se diu ecessisse Missam animo à Missa alienissimo.

And now that is thus clear from so many instances of the greatest Men in the Roman Church, which this last Age has produced; and from whose discovery we may reasonably enough infer the like of many others that have not come to our knowledge, that several Persons who have lived and enjoyed some of the greatest Honours and Dignities in that Communion, have nevertheless been Hereticks in
this

this point; may I beseech those who are still misled with this great Error, to stop a while, and seriously examine with me two or three plain considerations, and in which I suppose they are not a little concerned.

And the first is, Of their own danger: but especially upon their Own Principles.

It is but a very little while since an ingenious Person now living in the French Church, the

Abbé Petit publish'd a Book which

he calls (a) The truths of the

'Christian Religion proved and

'defended against the antient Here-

'sies by the Truth of the Eucha-

'rist: And what he means by this

'truth, he thus declares in his Preface,

'viz. the change of (b) the Bread

'into the Body of the Son of God,

'and of the Wine into his Blood.

'He there pretends that this Do-

'ctrine however combatted by us

'now, was (c) yet more undoubt-

'ed in the Primitive Church than

'either the divinity of Christ and

'the Holy Ghost, or the certainty

'of our future Resurrection. And

'this he wrote as the Title tells us,

'(d) To confirm the new Converts

'in the Faith of the Catholick Church; meaning

according to their usual figure, the Roman. How

far this extravagant undertaking may serve to

convince them I cannot tell; this I know, that if

we

(a) *Les Veritez de La Religion prouvées & défendues contre les anciennes Hérésies, par la vérité de l'Eucharistie. 1686.*

(b) *Que du pain divin le Corps du fils de Dieu, & du Vin son sang. Preface p. 7.*

(c) *Quoiqu'il n'y ait point, présentement de vérités plus incontestables que les trois grands articles de nostre foi, qui sont contenus dans le symbole, c'est à dire, la divinité de J. C. la divinité du S. Esprit, & la Résurrection: Cependant j'ose dire que la présence réelle de J. C. au Saint Sacrement étoit une vérité encore plus indubitable dans les premiers siècles de l'Eglise. Pref. p. 5.*

(d) *Traité pour confirmer les Nouveaux-Convertis dans la foi de l'Eglise Catholique.*

we may credit those who have been that Abbot's most intimate acquaintance, he believes but very little of it himself, unless he also be become in this point, a new Convert.

But now if what has before been said of so many eminent Persons of their Church be true, as after a due and diligent examination of every particular there set down, I must beg leave to profess I am fully perswaded that it is; 'twill need no long deduction to shew how dangerous an influence their unbelief must have had, in some of the chiefest instances of their constant Worship.

(e) Concil.

Trid. Sess. vii.

Can. 11. si quis

dixerit in mini-

stris dum Sa-

cramenta confi-

ciunt, non re-

quiri intenti-

onem, saltem sa-

ciendi quod sa-

cit Ecclesia,

Anathema sit.

(f) Vid. de

defectibus circa

Missam, c. de

defectu Intenti-

onis. In Miss-

ali. R.

For 1. It is the Doctrine of the (e) Council of Trent that to make a Sacrament, the Priest must have, if not an Actual, yet at least a Virtual Intention of doing that which the Church does:

And in the (f) Rubricks of their Missal, the want of such an Intention in the Priest is one of the defects there set down as sufficient to hinder a Consecration. Now if this be true, as every Roman Catholick who acknowledges the Authority of that Synod must believe it to be; 'tis then evident that in all those Masses which any of the Persons I before named have said, there could have been no Consecration: It being absurd to suppose that they who believed not Transubstantiation, could have an intention to make any such change of the Bread into the Body of Christ, which they thought it impossible to do.

Now if there were no Consecration, but that the Bread continued meer Bread as it was before; then Secondly, All those who attended at their Masses, and Adored their Hosts, pay'd the supream worship of God to a bare Wafer, and no more. How far the modern

modern plea of their good Intention to Adore Christ in those sacred Offices, may excuse them from having committed Idolatry, it is not necessary I should here examine. They who desire a satisfaction in this matter, may please to recur to a late excellent Treatise written purposely on this Subject, and where they will find the weakness of this supposal sufficiently exposed. But since (a) many of their own greatest Men confess that if any one by mistake should worship an Unconsecrated Host, taking it to have been Consecrated, he would be guilty of Idolatry; and that such an Error would not be sufficient to excuse him; may they please to consider with what Faith they can pay this Divine Adoration to that which all their Senses tell them is but a bit of Bread; to the hinderance of whose Conversion so many things may interpose, that were their Doctrine otherwise as infallible, as we are certain it is false, it would yet be a hundred to one that there is no Consecration: in a word; how they can worship that which they can never be secure is changed into Christ's Body, nay when, as the examples I have before given shew, they have all the reason in the World to fear, whether even the Priest himself who says the Mass does indeed believe that he has any Power, or by consequence can have any intention, to turn it into the Flesh of Christ.

And the same consideration will shew, Thirdly; How little security their other Plea of Concomitance, which they so much insist upon, to shew the sufficiency of their Communicating only in one kind, viz. 'that they receive the Blood in the 'Body, can give to the Laity, to satisfy their

E

Consciences

A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host. Lond. 1685.
(a) Vid. Catharin. in Cajo. pag. 133. Ed. Paris. 1535. Where he quotes S. Thomas and Paludanus for the same Opinion: This Book of his was seen and approved by the Pope's order by the Divines at Paris: as himself tells us in the review of it. Lugdun. 1542.

Consciences that they ever partake of that Blessed Sacrament as they ought to do. Since whatever is pretended of Christ's Body, 'tis certain there can be none of his Blood in a meer Wafer: And if by reason of the Priest's infidelity, the Host should be indeed nothing else, of which we have shewn they can never be sure; neither can they ever know whether what they receive be upon their own Principles, an intire Communion.

And then Lastly, for the main thing of all, The Sacrifice of the Mass; it is clear that if Christ's Body be not truly and properly offer'd; nor any of those great benefits be derived to them from a morsel of Bread, which themselves declare can proceed only from the Flesh and Blood of their Blessed Lord.

It is I know an easie matter for those who can helieve Transubstantiation, to believe also that there is no hazard in all these great and apparent dangers. But yet in matters of such moment Men ought to desire to be well assured, and not exposed

evento any possible defects. I do not now insist upon the common remarks, which yet are Authorized by their own Missal, and may give just grounds to their fears; 'That if the Wafer be not made of 'Wheat but of some other Corn, 'there is then no Consecration: 'If it be mixed not with common, but distill'd Water, it is 'doubtful whether it be Consecrated. If the Wine be sowre

'to such a certain degree, that then it becomes 'incapable

De defectibus circa Missam: De defectu panis. Si panis non sit triticeus, vel si triticeus, sit admixtus granis alterius generis in tantâ quantitate, ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel sit aliqui corruptus: non conficitur Sacramentum. Si sit confectus de aquâ rosacâ vel alterius distillationis, dubium est an conficiatur? Et de defectu vini. Si Vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de vitis acerbis seu non maturis expressum, vel admixtum tantam aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur Sacramentum.

'incapable of being changed into the Blood of
'Christ; with many more of the like kind, and
which render it always uncertain to them, whether
there be any change made in the
blessed Elements or no; * the Re-
lations I have given, are not of
counterfeit Jews and Moors, who
to escape the danger of the Inqui-
sition have sometimes become Priests,
and administred all the Sacraments for many years
together, without ever having an intention to Ad-
minister truly any one of them, and of which I could
give an eminent instance in a certain Jew now
living; who for many Tears was not only a Priest,
but a Professor of Divinity in Spain, and all the
while in reality a meer Jew as he is now. The
Persons here mention'd were Men of undoubted re-
putation, of great learning and singular esteem in
their Church; and if these found the impossibili-
ties of Transubstantiation so much greater than ei-
ther the pretended Authority or Infallibility of their
Church; certainly they may have just cause to fear,
whether many others of their Priests do not Live in
the same infidelity in which these have Died, and
so expose them to all the hazards now mentioned,
and which are undeniably the consequences of such
their Unbelief.

But these are not the only dangers I would desire
those of that Communion to reflect on upon this
occasion. Another there is, and of greater conse-
quence than any I have hitherto mentioned, and
which may perhaps extend not only to this Holy
Eucharist, but it may be to the invalidating of most
of their other Sacraments. * It is the Doctrine of the

* Du Moslin, in the place above
cited, mentions one that in his
time was burnt at Loudun for Con-
secrating a Host in the name of
the Devil. *Thes. Sedann. Th.* 97. n.
10. p. 846. Vol. 1.

* Eugenii IV.
decret. in Aff.
Concil. Flo-
rent. Ann.
1439. Concil
Labb. Tom. 13.
p. 525. Con-
cil. Trident.
Sess. VII. Can.
2.

Roman Church *that to the Validity of every Sacrament, and therefore of that of Orders as well as the rest three things must concur, 'a due matter, a 'right form, and the Person of the Minister conferring the Sacrament, with an intention of doing 'what the Church does. Where either of these is wanting, the Sacrament is not performed. If therefore the Bishop in conferring the Holy Order of Priesthood has not an intention of doing what the Church does, 'tis plain that the Person to be ordained receives no Priestly Character of him; nor by consequence has any power of consecrating the Holy Eucharist, or of being hereafter advanced to a higher degree. Now the form of conferring the Order of Priesthood they determine to be this;*

† *Ibid. pag.*
538. *Catech.*
Concil. Trid.
de Sacr. Ord.
n. xxii. p. 222.
Item, n. L. p.
228.

† The Bishop delivers the Cup with some Wine, and the Paten with Bread into the Hands of the person whom he Ordains, saying, 'Receive the Power of offering a Sacrifice in the Church for ~~the~~ living and the dead, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. By which Ceremony and words, their Catechism tells us, He is constituted an Interpreter and Mediator between God and Man; which is to be esteemed the chiefest Function of a Priest. So that then the intention necessary to the conferring the Order of Priesthood is this; to give a Power to consecrate, i. e. to Transubstantiate the Host into Christ's Body, and so offer it as a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.

If therefore any of their Bishops, for instance Cardinal du Perron, or Monsieur de Marca, did not believe that either the Church or themselves as Bishops of it, had any Authority to confer any such Power,

Power, ~~they~~ could not certainly have any Intention of doing in this case what the Church intends to do. Having no such Intention, the Persons whom they pretended to Ordain were no Priests. Being no Priests they had no Power to Consecrate. All the Hosts therefore which were either offered or taken, or worshipped in any of the Masses celebrated by those Priests whom these two Bishops Ordained, were only meer Bread, and not the Body of Christ; And as many of them, as being afterwards advanced to a higher dignity, were consecrated Bishops, received no Episcopal Character, because they were destitute of the Priestly before. Thus the danger still encreases: For by this means, the Priests whom they also Ordain are no Priests; and when any of them shall be promoted to a higher degree, are incapable of being made Bishops; And so by the Infidelity of these two Men, there are at this day infinite numbers of Priests and Bishops, who say Mass, and confer Orders without any manner of power to do either; and in a little time it may be there shall not be a true Bishop or Priest in the whole Gallicane Church. But,

II. A second Consideration which I would beg leave to offer from the fore-going instances is this: What reliance we can make upon the Pretended Infallibility of their Church; when 'tis thus plain that so many of the most learned Men of their own Communion did not only not believe it to be Infallible, but supposed it to have actually Erred, and that in those very Doctrines that are at this day esteemed the most considerable Points in difference between Us.

It is plain from what has been said in the foregoing reflection, that disbelieving Transubstantiation, they must also have lookt upon all the other Consequences of it, viz. the Adoration of the Host, the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. as Erroneous too. Now though it be not yet agreed among them, nor ever likely to be, where the supposed Infallibility of their Church is seated, yet since all manner of Authority has conspired to establish these things; Popes have decreed them, Councils defined them, and both Popes and Councils anathematized all those that shall presume to doubt of them; 'tis evident either these Men did not believe the Church to be Infallible, as is pretended; or they did not believe the Roman, to be, according to the modern phrase, indeed the Catholick Church.

III. *And upon the same grounds there will arise a third Reflection, which they may please to make with us; and that is, with what Reason they can press us with the Authority of their Church in these matters; when such eminent persons of their own Communion, and who certainly were much more Obligated to it than we can be thought to be, yet did not esteem it sufficient to enslave their belief.*

It is a reproach generally cast upon us, that we set up a private Spirit in opposition to the Wisdom and Authority of the Church of God: and think our selves better able to judge in matters of Faith, than the most General Council that was ever yet assembled. This is usually said, but is indeed a foul Misrepresentation of our Opinion. All we say is, that every Man ought to act Rationally in matters of Religion, as well as in other concerns; to em-

ploy

ploy his Understanding with the utmost skill and diligence that he is able, to know God's will, and what it is that he requires of us. We do not set up our own judgments against the Authority of the Church; but having both the Holy Oracles of God, and the Definitions of Men before us, we give to each their proper weight. And therefore if the one at any time contradicts the other, we resolve, as is most fitting, not that our own, but God's Authority revealed to us in his Word, is to be preferred. And he who without this examination servilely gives up himself to follow whatever is required of him; He may be in the right, if his Church or Guide be so; but according to this method shall never be able to give a reason of his Faith; nor if he chance to be born in a False Religion, ever be in a capacity of being better instructed. For if we must be allowed nothing but to obey only, and not presume to enquire why; He that is a Jew must continue a Jew still; he that is a Turk, a Turk; a Protestant must always be a Protestant: In short, in whatsoever profession any one now is, in that he must continue, whether true or false, if reason and examination must be excluded all place in matters of Religion.

* And indeed after all their clamours against us * All this is-
on this occasion, yet is this no more than what them- lately granted
selves require of us when 'tis in order to their own by the Carbo-
advantage. Is a Proselyte to be made, they offer to him lick Represent-
their Arguments: They tell him a long story of their ter. Cap. VI.
Church; the Succession, Visibilty, and other Notes of
it. To what purpose is all this, if we are not to be Judges,
to examine their pretences whether these are sufficient
marks of such a Church as they suppose; and if they are,
whether they do indeed agree to theirs, and then upon
a full

a full conviction submit to them. Now if this be their intention, 'tis then clear, let them pretend what they will, that they think us both capable of judging in these matters, and that we ought to follow that, which all things considered we find to be most reasonable, which is all that we desire.

And for this we have here the undoubted Examples of those Eminent Persons of their own Communion before named; who notwithstanding the Authority of their Church, and the decision of so many Councils esteemed by it as General, have yet both thought themselves at liberty to examine their Decrees, and even to pass sentence too upon them, that they were erroneous in the Points here mentioned. And therefore certainly we may modestly desire the same liberty which themselves take; at least till we can be convinced, (and that by such Arguments as we shall be allow'd to judge of,) that there is such an infallible Guide whom we ought in all things to follow without further inquiry, and where we may find him; and when this is done I will for my part promise as freely to give up myself to his Conduct, as I am till then, I think reasonably, resolved to follow what according to the best of my ability in proving all things, I shall find indeed to be Good.

IV. *I might from the same Principles, Fourthly, argue the Reasonableness of our Reformation, at least in the opinion of those great Men of whom we have hitherto been speaking: And who thinking it allow'd to them to dissent themselves from the received Doctrine of their Church, which they found to be erroneous, could not but in their Consciences justify us, who, as a national Church, no way subjected*

to their Authority, did the same; and by the right which every such Church has within it self, reformed those Errors, which like the Tares were sprung up with the Good Seed. This 'tis evident they must have approved; and for one of them, the Abbot of Ville-loyne, I have been assured by some of his intimate Acquaintance, that he had always a particular respect for the Church of England, and which others of their Communion at this day esteem to be neither Heretical nor Schismatical.

V. *But I may not insist on these things, and will therefore finish this Address with this only remonstrance to them; That since it is thus evident, that for above 1200 years this Doctrine was never establish'd in the Church, nor till then, in the opinion of their own most learned Men, any matter of Faith; since the Greatest of their Writers in the past Ages have declared themselves so freely concerning it as we have seen above, and some of the most eminent of their Communion in the present have ingenuously acknowledged that they could not believe it; since 'tis confess'd that the Scripture does not require it; Sense and Reason undoubtedly oppose it, and the Primitive Ages of the Church, as one of their own Authors has very lately shewn, received it not; They will at least suffer all these things to dispose them to an indifferent Examination, wherefore at last it is that they do believe this great Error? Upon what Authority they have given up their Senses to Delusion; their Reason to embrace Contradictions; the Holy Scripture and Antiquity, to be submitted to the dictates of two Assemblies, which many of themselves esteem to have been rather Cabals than Councils:*

cils : *And all to support a Doctrine, the most injurious that can be to our Saviour's Honour ; destructive in its nature not only of the certainty of the Christian Religion, but of every thing else in the World ; which if Transubstantiation be true, must be all but Vision : for that cannot be true unless the Senses of all Mankind are deceived in judging of their proper Objects, and if this be so, we can then be sure of nothing.*

These Considerations, if they shall incline them to an impartial view of the following Discourses, they may possibly find somewhat in them, to shew the reasonableness of our dissent from them in this matter : However they shall at least I hope engage those of our own Communion to stand firm in that Faith which is thus strongly supported with all sorts of Arguments ; and convince them how dangerous it is for Men to give up themselves to such prejudices, as neither Sense nor Reason, nor the word of God, nor the Authority of the best and purest Ages of the Church, are able to overcome.

A
T A B L E
OF THE
Principal Matters
Contained in this
T R E A T I S E.

P R E F A C E.

T HE occasion of this Discourse.	Page i
The method made use of for the explaining the nature of this Holy Eucharist.	iv
No Proof of Transubstantiation in Holy Scripture.	v
The rise and establishment of it.	vi, vii
Several of their greatest Men before the Council of Trent believed it not.	vii, viii
And many have ever since continued to disbelieve it.	x
	So

A Table of the Principal Matters

So, Picherellus.	x	F. SIRMOND.	xv
Cardinal du PERRON.	xi	Monsieur L — .	xvii
F. Barnes.	xii	Mons. de Marolles.	ib.
Monsieur de MARCA.	xiii	Others.	xxiv, &c.

Consequences drawn from these Examples :

- I. *Of the danger of the Papists, especially upon their own Principles.* xxvii
With reference to this Sacrament : and therein to the
 1. *Consecration.* xxvii
 2. *Adoration.* ib.
 3. *Communion in one kind.* xxix
 4. *Mafs.* xxx*With reference to their entire Priesthood.* xxxi
- II. *Against the Infallibility of the Roman Church.* xxxiii
- III. *Against its Authority.* xxxiv
- IV. *As to the Reasonableness of our Reformation.* xxxvi
- V. *That these things ought to dispose those of that Communion to an impartial search into the grounds of their belief as to this matter.* xxxvii

P A R T I.

The Introduction.

Of the Nature of this Holy Sacrament in the General.
Pag. 1

Christ's design in the Institution of it. 2
That he establish'd it upon the Ceremonies of the Jewish Pasover. 3, 4, 5, 6
The method from hence taken to explain the nature of it. 6, 7
CHAP.

C H A P. I.

*Of Transubstantiation; or the Real Presence established
by the Church of Rome.* 8

What is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in this point. ib.

--This shewn upon the Principle before laid down, to be repugnant,

1. *To the design and nature of this Holy Sacrament.* 12

2. *To the expression it self, This is my Body.* 14

The Papists themselves sensible of it. 18

That the Sixth of S. John does not at all favour them. 20

--This Doctrine shewn further to be repugnant,

I. *To the best and purest Tradition of the Church.* 24

II. *To the right Reason.* 32

III. *To the common Sense of all Mankind.* 36

Conclusion of this Point, and transition to the next. 37

C H A P. II.

*Of the Real Presence acknowledged by the Church of
England.* 41

*The notion of the Real Presence falsely imputed, by a late Author
to our Church.* 42

In answer to this Four things proposed to be considered,

I. *What is the true notion of the Real Presence as acknowledged by the Church of England.* 43

II. *That*

A Table of the Principal Matters

II. That this Notion has been constantly maintained by our most		
Learned and Orthodox Divines.		46
---So those abroad; Calvin.		47
Beza.		49
Martyr, &c.		51
---For our own Divines; consider the express words of		
the twenty ninth Article, in K. Edw. VI. time.		52
Archbishop Cranmer.		53
Bishop Ridley.		55
---That the same continued to be the Opinion of our Divines		
after.		56

Shewn

1. From the History of the Convocations proceeding as		
to this point in the beginning of Q. Eliz. Reign.		ib.
2. From the Testimonies of our Divines.		
---Bp. Jewell.		59
---Mr. Hooker.		60
---Bp. Andrews.		62
---A. B. of Spalatto.		64
---Bp. Montague		ib.
---Bp. Taylour.		66
---Mr. Torndyke.		69

Whose Testimonies are cited at large: Of

1. Reformatio Legum Ec-	5. Dr. Jo. White.
clesiasticarum.	6. Dr. Fr. White.
2. Bp. Morton.	7. Dr. Jackson.
3. A. B. Usher.	8. Dr. Hammond.
4. Bp. Cofens.	

Whose Authorities are refer'd to;

III. That the alterations which have been made in our Ru-	71, 72
brick, were not upon the account of our Divines changing	
their Opinions, as is vainly and falsely suggested.	72

IV. That

contained in this Treatise.

IV. *That the Reasons mentioned in our Rubrick, concerning the Impossibility of Christ's Natural Body's existing in several places at the same time, is no way invalidated by any of this Author's Exceptions against it.* 77

1. *Nor by his First Observation.* ib.

2. *Nor by his Second.* 79

3. *Nor by his Third.* 80

4. *Nor by his Fourth.* 81

The Objection, of this Opinion's, being downright Zuinglianifm ;
Answered. 82

And the whole concluded. 84

P A R T II

C H A P. III

Of the Adoration of the Host as prescribed and practised in the Church of Rome.

Two things proposed to be considered ;

I. *What the Doctrine of the Church of England as to this point is.* 86

Our Authors exceptions against it, Answered. 87

II. *What is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome ; and whether what this Author has said in favour of it may be sufficient to warrant their Practice as to this matter.*

Their Doctrine stated. 91
ib.

The:

A Table of the Principal Matters, &c.

The Defence of it, unsufficient: *shewn in Answer,*

1. To his Protestant Concessions. 93

2. To his Catholick Assertions.

<i>First.</i>	96	<i>Fifth.</i>	102
<i>Second.</i>	99	<i>Sixth.</i>	103
<i>Third.</i>	ib.	<i>Seventh.</i>	104
<i>Fourth.</i>	100	<i>Eighth.</i>	ib.

3. To the Grounds he offers of their Belief. 105

The Lutherans Practice no Apology for theirs. 106

Ground	<i>First.</i>	Answer'd.	<i>First.</i>
	<i>Second.</i>		<i>Second.</i>
	<i>Third.</i>		<i>Third.</i>
	<i>Fourth.</i>		<i>Fourth.</i>
	<i>Fifth.</i>		<i>Fifth.</i>

Some Arguments proposed, upon their own Principles, against
this Adoration. 117

Conclusion. 125

ERRATA.

PAG. xvii. l. 10. fourth r. sixth. p. xviii. l. 10. in r. on. p. xxii. l. 33. r. they are. p. xxiv. l. 5. r. That thou. p. 13. marg. Hammond. l. 6. p. 129. p. 64. marg. Casaubon. ib. l. 19. Body is of Christ. p. 76. l. 24. dele. which. p. 80. l. 15. then that. p. 91. l. 27. r. this Holy. p. 98. l. 16. for then r. the. p. 112. l. 18. Catholick. l. 20. asks.

A few lesser Faults there are, which the Reader may please to correct.

21

A
DISCOURSE
OF THE
Holy Eucharist,

With particular Reference
To the two GREAT POINTS
OF THE
REAL PRESENCE,
AND
The Adoration of the HOST.

INTRODUCTION.
*Of the Nature of this HOLY SACRAMENT
in the General.*

TO understand the true design of our
Blessed Saviour, in the *Institution* of this
Holy Sacrament, we cannot, I suppose,
take any better course than to consider
first of all, what Account the Sacred
Writers have left us of the *Time* and *Manner* of the
doing of it.

G

Now

Introduction.

* Matt. xxvi.

Now for this St. Paul tells us, *I Cor. II. 23.*
"That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was
betray'd (having first eaten the Passover according to
the Law, Exod. 12. Matt. xxvi. 20.) took Bread, and
*"when he had given thanks he brake it, * and gave*
"it to the Disciples, and said, Take, Eat, This is my
"Body which is broken for you, This do in Remembrance
"of Me. After the same manner also he took the Cup
"when he had supp'd, saying, This Cup is the New-Te-
"stament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye Drink
"it in Remembrance of me.

Such is the Account which St. Paul gives us of
 the *Original* of this *Holy Sacrament*: Nor do the
 Evangelists dissent from it; only that St. Matthew
 with reference to the *Cup*, adds, *Drink ye ALL of*
it, Matt. xxvi. 27. to which St. Mark subjoins a par-
 ticular Observation, and which ought not here to
 be pass'd by, *"That they ALL drank of it*, Mark
 xiv. 23.

It is not to be doubted, but that the design of our
 Blessed Saviour in instituting this *Holy Sacrament*,
 was to Abolish the *Jewish Passover*, and to establish
 the Memory of another, and a much greater *Deliv-*
erance, than that of the first-born, now to be wrought
 for the whole World in his Death. The *Bread*
 which he brake, and the *Wine* which he poured out,
 being such clear *Types* of his *Body* to be broken,
 his *Blood* to be shed for the Redemption of Man-
 kind, that it is impossible for us to doubt of the Appli-
 cation.

And as God Almighty under the Law, designed
 that other Memorial of the *Paschal Lamb*, now
 changed into a so much better and more excellent Re-
 membrance, to continue as long as the Law its self
 stood

Introduction.

5

stood in force: So this Blessed *Eucharist*, establish'd by Christ in the room of it, must no doubt have been intended by Him, to be continued in his Church, as long as the *Covenant* seal'd with that *Blood* which it exhibits, stands: And therefore, that since *that* shall never be abolish'd; 'tis evident that *this* also will remain our Duty, and be our perpetual Obligation to the end of the World.

This is the import of our Saviours Addition, *Do this in Remembrance of Me*; and is by St. Paul more fully expressed in those Words, which he immediately subjoins to the History of the Institution before recited, 1 Cor. xi. 26. "*For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew, i. e. in the Jewish Phrase, set forth, Commemorate the Lords Death till his coming.*"

And that this Holy *Sacrament* now establish'd in the place of the *Jewish Passover*, might be both the better understood, and the easier received by them; it is a thing much to be remarked for the right explaining of it, how exactly he accommodated all the Notions and Ideas of that Ancient *Ceremony* to this new *Institution*.

I. In that *Paschal Supper*, the Master of the House took *Bread*, and presenting it before them, instead of the usual *Benediction of the Bread*, He brake it, and gave it to them, saying, || *This is the Bread of Affliction which our Fathers ate in Egypt*. In this *Sacred Feast*, our Saviour in like manner takes *Bread*, the very *Loaf*, which the *Jews* were wont to take for the Ceremony before mentioned; breaks it, and gives it to his Disciples,

|| See Dr. Hammond on Mat. xxvi. lit. E. Casaubon in Mat. xxvi. 26. &c.

נִפְּוֹשׁ לֶפֶס*

Vid. Bux-
torf. Vindic.
contr. Capel.

P. 14. Hammond in Mat. xxvi. l. c. &c.

saying, *This is my Body which is broken for you*; alluding thereby; not only to their Ceremony in his Action, but even to their very manner of Speech in his Expression, to the *Passover* before them, which in their Language they constantly called, * the *Body of the Paschal Lamb*.

† Allix prepara-
rat. a la Sainte
Cene. cap. 2.
pag. 16.

II. In that *Ancient Feast*, the Master of the House in like manner after Supper took the *Cap*, and having given thanks, gave it to them, saying, † *This is the Fruit of the Vine, and the Blood of the Græpe*. In this *Holy Sacrament* our Blessed Lord in the very same manner takes the *Cap*, he Blesses it, and gives it to his Disciples saying, *This Cap is the New-Testament in my Blood*; his Action being again the very same with theirs; and for his Expression, it is that which *Moses* used, when he ratified the *Ancient Covenant* between God and the *Jews*; [Exod. xxiv. 8. compared with *Hebr.* ix 20.] saying, *This is the Blood of the Testament*.

* Dr. Light-
foots Heb &
Talmud. Ob-
servat. on Mat.
xxvi. ver. 26,
27. T. 2. p.
258, 260.

III. In that *Ancient Feast*, after all this was finish'd, they were wont to sing a * *Hymn*, the *Psalms* yet extant, from the cxiii. to the cxix. thence called by them, *the Great Hallelujah*. In this *Holy Supper*, our Saviour and his Disciples are expressly recorded to have done the like, and very probably in the self-same words. [See *Matt.* xxvi. 30. *Mark* xiv. 26.] In a word, *Lastly*,

וכי *

IV. That *ancient Passover* the *Jews* were commanded to keep in memory of their *Deliverance* out of *Egypt*. The bitter Herbs were a * *Remembrance* of the bitter servitude they underwent there, *Exod.* i. 14.
The

Introduction.

5

The red Wine was a † Memorial of the Blood of the Children of *Israel* slain by *Pharaoh*: And for this they were expressly commanded by *Moses*, *Exod.* xiii. 8. to * *SHBW*, i.e. to annunciate or tell forth to their Children what the Lord had done for them. And so in this *Holy Sacrament*, Christ expressly institutes it for the same end, * *Do this*, says he, *in remembrance of me*; which *St. Paul* thus explains, *1 Cor.* xi. 26. "*For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do (or rather, do ye) * SHEW (the very word before used) 'the Lords death till his coming.*"

זכור †

והנחת לבנק*

* 'Εἰς τὴν
ἀμνησιν ἀναμνη-
σιν.

* Τὸν θάνα-
τον τοῦ κυρίου
καταγγέλλετε.

So clear an Allusion does every part of this *Sacrament* bear to that ancient *Solemnity*; and we must be more blind than the *Jews* themselves, not to see, that as that other *Sacrament* of *Baptism* was instituted by Christ from the Practice and Custom of the † *Jewish* Doctors, who received their Proselytes by the like washing; so was this *Holy Eucharist* established upon the Analogy which we have seen to the *Paschal Supper*, whose place it supplies, and whose Ceremonies it so exactly retains, that it seems only to have heightened the design, and changed the Application to a more excellent Remembrance.

|| See Dr. Ham-
monds Practi-
cal Catechism
Lib. 6. pag.
115. Oper.
fol. Lond.
1684.

I know not how far it may be allow'd to confirm this Analogy, That it was one of the most ancient Traditions among the * *Jews* of old, that the *Messiah* should come and work out their deliverance, *The very same night in which God had brought them out of Egypt, the night of the Paschal Solemnity.* But

* Vid. Fagi-
um. in Anno-
tat. in *Exod.*
xii. 13. where
he renders
their words

thus, "*Et in eadem die viz. xv. mensis Nisan, sc. Martii, redimendus est Israel in diebus Messia.*" Vid. Vol. 1. Critic. M. p 498.

certain-

certainly considerable it is, that as God under the Law, the same night in which he deliver'd them, instituted the *Passover* to be a perpetual *Memorial* of it throughout their Generations ; so here our Saviour instituted his *Communion* not only in the same Night in which he deliver'd us, but immediately after having eaten His last *Passover* ; to shew us, that what that *Solemnity* had hitherto been to the *Jews*, this *Sacrament* should from henceforth be to us ; and that we by this Ceremony should commemorate ours, as they by that other had been commanded to do their Deliverance.

This the Holy *Scriptures* themselves direct us to, by so often calling our Blessed Saviour in express terms, "*The Lamb of God*, *Joh. i. 29.* *St. Peter* speaking of our Redemption wrought by Him, tells us, that it was not obtained by "*corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but by the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot*, *1 Pet. i. 18.* And *St. Paul* so clearly directs us to this allusion, that no possible doubt can remain of it ; "*Christ*, says he, *our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the Feast*, *2 Cor. i. v. 7.*

And now after so many Arguments for this *Application*, as, being joined together, I think I might almost call a Demonstration of it ; I suppose I may without scruple lay down this foundation both for the unfolding of the nature of this Holy *Sacrament* in the General, and for the Examination of those two great *points* I am here to consider in particular, *viz.* That our Saviour in this *Institution* addressing himself to *Jews*, and speaking in the direct form

form of the *Paschal* Phrases; and in a *Ceremony* which 'tis thus evident he designed to introduce in the stead of that *Solemnity*; The best method we can take for explaining both the *words* and *intent* of this *Communion*, will be to examine what such men to whom he spake must necessarily have conceived to be his meaning, but especially on an occasion wherein it neither became him to be obscure; and the Apostles silence, not one of them demanding any explication of his words, as at other times they were wont to do, clearly shewing that he was not difficult to be understood.

This only *Postulate* being granted, which I think I have so good reason to expect; I shall now go on to examine by it, the first great *Point* proposed to be consider'd, *viz.* Of the *Real Presence* of Christ in this *Holy Sacrament*, and that

1st. As established by the Church of *Rome*.

2^{dly}. As acknowledged by the Church of *England*.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

Of TRANSUBSTANTIATION,

Or the Real Presence Establish'd by the CHURCH of ROME.

* Concil. Trid.
Sess. 13. cap. 4.
& Can. 2.

Transubstantiation is defined by the * Council of Trent, to be "A *WONDERFUL* " *CONVERSION* of the whole Substance " of the Bread, in this Holy Sacrament, in- " to the whole substance of the Body of Christ, and of " the whole substance of the Wine into his Blood; the " Species or Accidents only of the Bread and Wine re- " maining.

For the better understanding of which *Wonderful Conversion*, because the Church of *Rome*, which is not very liberal in any of her Instructions, has taken † particular care that this should not be too much explain'd to the People, as well knowing it to be a Doctrine so absurd, that even their credulity could hardly be able to digest it; it may not be amiss if, from the very words of their own *Catechism*, we examine a little farther into it.

Now three things there are, which, they tell us, must be consider'd in it:

I. That

† Catechif-
mus ad Paro-
chos. Par. II.
cap. de Euch.
Sacr. n. 39.
41, 43.

I. * "That the *true Body* of Christ our Lord, the
"very same that was *Born* of the *Virgin*, and now
"sits in Heaven at the right hand of the Father, is
"contained in this Sacrament.

* Catech. ibid.
n. xxv. Sect.
Primum.

"Now by the *true Body*, they mean not only
"his *Human Body*, and whatsoever belongs to it,
"as *Bones, Sinews, &c.* to be contain'd in this Sacra-
"ment; || But the *intire Christ*, God and Man; so
"that the *Eucharistical Elements* are changed in-
"to our Saviour, as to *both* his *Substances*, and the
"consequences of *both*, his *Blood, Soul*, and *Di-*
"vinity its self, all which are really present in
"this Sacrament; * the *Body* of Christ by the
"Consecration, the rest by *Concomitance* with the
"Body.

|| Ibid. n. xxxi.
Sect. *Torus*
Christus ut
Deus & Ho-
mo in Eucha-
ristia contine-
tur.

* Ibid. n. xxxiii.
Sect. *Per Con-*
comitantiam
in Euch. quæ
sint.

Again: When 'tis said, "† That the *whole Sub-*
"stance of the *Bread* is changed into his *whole Body*,
"and the *whole Substance* of the *Wine* into his *whole*
"Blood; this is not to be so understood, as if the
"Bread did not contain the *whole Substance* of his
"Blood, as well as of his *Body*, and so the *Wine*, the
"whole *Substance* of his *Body*, as well as of his *Blood*;
"(:) seeing Christ is intire in each part of the Sa-
"crament, nay in every the least *Crumb* or *Drop*, of
"either part.

† Ibid. n. xxxix.
Sect. *Conver-*
sio quæ fit in
Euchar. &c.

(:) Ibid. n.
xxxv. Sect.
Christus totus
in qualibet
particula, &
n. xlii. &c.

* Ibid. n. xxv.
Sect. *Secun-*
dum.

II. "The * second thing to be consider'd for
"the understanding of this Mystery, is, That not
"any part of the *Substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine*
"remains; tho *nothing* may seem more contrary to the
"Senses than this; in which they are certainly in the
"right.

H

III. "† That

† Ibid. n. xxv.
Sect. Tertium
& n. xlii. Sect.
Accid. sine
subiecto const.
in Euch.

|| Ibid. n. xxxvii.
Sect. Primo
ratione.

* Ibid. n. xxxix.
Sect. Conver-
sio quæ fit in
Euch. &c.
† Ibid. n. xliii.
Quonam modo
Christus exi-
stat in Euchar.
(* *) Ibid. n.
xli. Sect. De
Transubstant.
curiosius non
inquirendum.

III. “† That the *Accidents* of the *Bread* and *Wine*,
“which either our *Eyes* see (as the *Colour*, *Form*, &c.)
“or our other *Senses* perceive (as the *Tast*, *Touch*,
“*Smell*) all these are in no *Subiect*, but exist by them-
“selves, after a *wonderful manner*, and which cannot
“be explain’d.

For the rest, the *Conversion* its self, “|| It is very
“difficult to be comprehended, How Christs *Bo-*
“*dy*, which before Consecration, was not in the
“Sacrament, should now come to be there, since
“’tis certain that *it changes not its place*, but is
“still all the while in Heaven. Nor is it made
“present there by *Creation*, * nor by any other
“*Change*; For it is neither increased nor dimi-
“nished, but remains whole in its Substance as be-
“fore. † Christ is not in the Sacrament *Locally*;
“for he has no *Quantity* there, is neither *Great* nor
“*Little*. (* *) In a word, Men ought not to
“inquire too curiously, how this *Change* can be
“made, for it is not to be comprehended, seeing
“neither in any natural Changes, nor indeed in the
“whole Creation, is there any Example of any thing
“like it.

Such is the Account which themselves give of
this *Mystery*: From all which we may in short
conclude the State of the Question before us, to
be this; That we do not dispute at all about
Christs *Real Presence*, which after a *Spiritual* and
Heavenly manner, we acknowledg in this Holy
Eucharist, as we shall hereafter shew; nor by con-
sequence of the *Truth* of Christs *Words* which
we undoubtedly believe: But only about this *Man-*
ner of his *Presence*, viz. Whether the *Bread* and
the

the *Wine* be changed into the very natural *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, so that the *Bread* and *Wine* themselves do no longer remain; But that under the *Appearance* of them is contain'd that same *Body* of Christ, which was *Born* of the Blessed *Virgin*, with his *Soul* and *Divinity*; which same *Body* of Christ, tho' *extended* in all its parts in Heaven, is at the same time in the Sacrament without any *Extension*, neither *Great* nor *Small*, comes thither neither by *Generation*, nor by *Creation*, nor by any *local Motion*; forasmuch as it continues still at the right Hand of God in Heaven, at the very same instant that it exists *whole* and *intire* in every consecrated *Host*, or *Chalice*; nay more, is *whole* and *intire*, not only in the *whole Host*, or the *whole Chalice*; but in every the *least Crumb* of the *Host*, and every the *least Drop* of the *Chalice*, here upon Earth.

And here it might well be thought a very needless, indeed an extravagant undertaking, to prove that those Elements, which so many of our Senses tell us, continue after their Consecration the very same, as to what concerns their *natural Substance*, that they were before, are in reality the very same: That what all the World *Sees*, and *Feels*, and *Smells*, and *Tasts*, to be *Bread* and *Wine*, is not changed into the very natural *Flesh* and *Blood* of a Body actually before existent; had it not entred into the Minds of so great a part of the Christian Church to joyn in the maintaining of a *Paradox*, which has nothing to defend it, but that fond Presumption they have certainly done well to take up, That they cannot possibly

Of Transubstantiation.

be in the *wrong*, and without which it would be very difficult for them to perswade any sober man that they are here in the *right*.

To shew that those *words*, which they tell us, work all this *Miracle*, and are the only reason that engages them to maintain so many absurdities as are confessedly the unavoidable Consequences of this Doctrine, have no such force nor interpretation as they pretend; I must desire it may be remembred what I before remark'd, That this Holy *Sacrament* was establish'd by our Saviour in the room of the *Jewish Passover*, and upon the very *Words* and *Ceremonies* of it. So that, if in that all things were *Typical*; the *Feast*, the *Customs*, the *Expressions* merely *allusive* to something that had been done before, and of which this sacred Ceremony was the *memorial*; we ought in all reason to conclude, that both our Saviour must have designed, and his Apostles understood this Holy *Sacrament* to have been the same too.

Now as to the *Nature* of the *Passover*; we have already seen that it was appointed by God as a *Remembrance* of his delivery of the *Jews* out of the Land of *Egypt*, when he slew all the *first-born* of the *Egyptians*, *Exod. xii.* The *Lamb* which they ate every year in this Feast, was an Eucharistical Sacrifice and *Type* of that first *Lamb* which was slain in the night of their deliverance, and whose Blood sprinkled upon the Posts of their Doors had preserved their Fore-fathers from the *destroying Angel*, that he should not do them any mischief. The *Bread of Affliction*, which they broke, and of which they said, perhaps in the very * same manner that

* Vid. *Cameron*. Annot. in

Matt. xxvi. 26. in illa verba, *Ασβετὴ ὄψωσθε*, inter critic. pag. 780. l. 24.

Christ did of the very same Loaf, *Take, eat, this is the Bread of affliction which our Fathers ate in Egypt*; they esteem'd a *Type* and *Figure*, of that unleaven'd Bread which their Forefathers so many Ages before had eaten there; and upon that account called it * *"The Memorial of their delivery out of Egypt.*

† The *Cup of Blessing* which they blessed, and of which they *ALL* drank in this Feast, they did it at once in memory both of the *Blood* of the Children of *Israel* slain by *Pharaoh*, and of the *Blood* of the *Lamb*, which being *sprinkled* upon their *doors*, preserved their own from being shed with that of the *Egyptians*.

Now all these *Idea's* with which the Apostles had so long been acquainted, could not but presently suggest to them the same design of our Blessed Saviour in the *Institution* of this Holy *Sacrament*: That when *He*, as the *Master* of the *Feast*, took the *Loaf*, *Blessed*, and *broke* it, and gave it to them, and Bid them in like manner henceforward, *Do this in Remembrance of Him*; He certainly designed that by this Ceremony, which hitherto they had used in *memory* of their deliverance out of *Egypt*, they should now continue the *memory* of their Blessed Lord, and of that deliverance which he was about to work for them. That as by calling the *Lamb* in that Feast "The *Body* of the *Passover*", they understood that it was the *remembrance* of God's mercy in commanding the *destroying Angel* to *pass over* their Houses when he slew their Enemies; the *memorial* of the *Lamb* which was killed for this purpose in *Egypt*; so Christ calling the *Bread* his *Body*, nay, his *Body broken* for them,

* Allix *Serm.*
pag. 503.

† Hammond
Pract. Cate-
chism. lib vi.
pag. Ed.
fol.

them, could certainly mean nothing else but that it was the *Type*, the *Memorial* of his *Body*, which as yet was not, but was now just ready to be given for their redemption.

This is so natural a reflection, and in one Part at least of this Holy Sacrament so necessary too, that 'tis impossible to explain it otherwise. "*This Cup*," says our Saviour, *is the New Testament in my Blood*; That is, as * *Moses* had before said of the *Old Testament* in the very same Phrase, the *seal*, the *ratification* of it. Now if those words be taken *literally*, then 1st. 'Tis the *Cup* that is *Transubstantiated*, not the *Wine*; 2^{ly}, It is *changed* not into *Christ's Blood* (as they pretend) but into the *New Testament* in his Blood; which being confessedly absurd and impossible, it must in all reason follow, That the Apostles understood our Saviour alike in both His Expressions; and that by consequence we ought to interpret those words, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, of the *Bread's* being the *Type*, or *Figure* of his *Body*; as we must that of the *Cup*, That it was the *New Testament in his Blood*, i. e. the *sign*, or *seal* of the *New Testament*.

So naturally do all these Notions direct us to a *figurative* interpretation of his Words; the whole *design* of this *Institution*, and all the *Parts* and *Ceremonies* of it being plainly *Typical*, in *Remembrance* (as Christ himself has told us) of *Him*. But now if we go on more particularly to inquire into the Expression its self, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, That will yet more clearly confirm this interpretation.

It

* See Exod. xxiv. 8. Heb. ix 20. And this Allusion is applied by S. Peter, 1 Ep. i 2. Vid. Hammond. Annot. in loc. lit. a.

It has before been observed, That these words of our Saviour in this Holy *Sacrament*, were used by him instead of that other Expression of the *Master* in the *Paschal Feast*, when in the very same manner he took the very same *Bread* into his Hands, and *blessed* it, and *brake* it, and *gave* it to those who were at the Table with Him, saying, *This is the Bread of affliction which our Fathers ate in Egypt.* And can any thing in the world be more plain, than that as never any *Jew* yet imagined, that the *Bread* which they thus took every year, was by that saying of the *Master* of their Feast changed into the very *substance* of that *Bread* which their forefathers had so many Ages before consumed in *Egypt*, in the night of their deliverance; but being thus broken and given to them, became a *Type*, a *Figure*, a *Memorial* of it: So neither could those to whom our Saviour Christ now spake, and who as being *Jews* had so long been used to this *Phrase*, ever imagine, that the pieces of that *Loaf* which He *brake*, and *gave* them, saying, "*This is my Body which is broken for you, Do this in Remembrance of me,*" became thereupon the very *Body* of that Saviour from whose Hands they received it; and who did not sure with one *member* of his *Body*, give away his *whole Body* from himself to them; but only designed that by this Ceremony they should *remember* Him, and his *Body broken* for them, as by the same they had hitherto *remembred* the *Bread of affliction which their Fathers ate in Egypt.*

I ought not to omit it, because it very much confirms the force of this Argument, That what I have here said of this *Analogy* of the Holy *Eucharist*, to the *Jewish*

Jewish Passover, was not the original remark of any *Protestant*, or indeed of any other Christians differing from the *Church of Rome* in this point : But was objected to them long before the *Reformation*, by the * *Jews*, themselves to shew that in their literal Interpretation of these Words, they had manifestly departed from the intention of our Blessed Saviour, and advanced a notion in which 'twas impossible for his Apostles, or any other acquainted, as they were, with the *Paschal* forms, ever to have understood him. And if † *St. Augustine*, who I suppose will not be thought a Heretick by either

* Vid. apud Author. *Fortalitii Fidei*, Lib. 4. Confid. 6. Impof. 10. Those who have not this Book, may find the Quotation at large in the late Edition of *Joan. Parisiensis*, in Præfat. pag. 73, 74.

† Epistol. xxiii. ad Bonifac. Vol. 2. pag. 29. Oper. Ed. Lugd. 1664.

party, may be allow'd to speak for the Christians ; he tells us, we are to look upon the Phrase, *This is my Body*, Just, says He, as when in ordinary conversation we are wont to say, This is *Christmas*, or *Good-Friday*, or *Easter-day* ; Not that this is the very day on which Christ was *born*, or *suffer'd*, or *rose* from the dead, but the return or remembrance of that day on which Christ was *born*, or *suffer'd*, or *rose* again.

It is wonderful to consider with what confidence our new *Missionaries* produce these words on all occasions ; and thereby shew us how fond they would be of the Holy Scripture, and how willingly they would make it their *Guide in Controversie*, did it but ever so little favour their Cause. Can any thing, say they, be more exprefs ? *This is my Body* ; Is it possible for words to be spoken more clear and positive ? And indeed were all the Expressions of Holy Scripture to be taken in their *literal* meaning, I will not deny, but that those words might as evidently

evidently prove *Bread* to be *Christs Body*, as those other in *St. John*, *I am the Bread that came down from Heaven*, argue a contrary *Transubstantiation* of *Christs Body* into *Bread*, *John vi. 48; 51.* or those more usual instances, *I am the true Vine; I am the door of the sheep; That Rock was Christ*; prove a great many *Transubstantiations* more, viz. of our Saviour into a *Vine*, a *Door*, and a *Rock*. But now, if for all this plainness and positiveness in these expressions, they themselves tell us, That it would be ridiculous to conclude from hence, that Christ was indeed turned into all these, and many other the like things; they may please to give us leave to say the same of this before us, it being neither less impossible, nor less unreasonable to suppose *Bread* to be changed into *Christs Body*, than for *Christs Body* to be changed into *Bread*, a *Vine*, a *Door*, a *Rock*, or whatever you please of the like kind.

But I have already shewn the ground of this mistake to be their want of considering the *Customs* and *Phrases* of the *Jewish Passover*, and upon which, both the *Holy Eucharist* it self, and these *Expressions* in it were founded: And I will only add this farther, in confirmation of it; That in the *Stile* of the *Hebrew Language* in general, there is nothing more ordinary, than for things to be said to * *Be* that which they *Signifie* or *Represent*. Thus *Joseph* interpreting *Pharaoh's Dream*,

* Expressions of this kind are very frequent in Holy

Scripture. *The seed is the Word of God*, *Luke viii. 11.* *The field is the World; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; The tares are the children of the wicked one*, *Matt. xiii. 38.* *The seven Angels are the Angels of the seven Churches; and the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches*, *Rev. i. 20.* With infinite more of the like kind.

Of Transubstantiation.

Gen. xli. 26. *The seven good Kine*, says he, *are seven years*; and again, *The seven good Ears of Corn are seven years*, i. e. as is plain, they signify seven years. And so in like manner in this place; *Christ took Bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, Eat, this is my Body which is Broken for you*: That is, this Bread thus Taken, and Blessed, and Broken, and Given to you; This Bread, and this Action, signifies and represents my Body which shall be Broken for you.

† See the Preface.

* See their Opinions collected by Monsieur Aubertine de Eucharistia, lib. 1. cap. 9. 11, 12, 13, 14.

* Tract. 2. de Verbis quibus Consecratur.

And indeed, after all this seeming assurance, it is nevertheless plain, That they themselves are not very well satisfied with their own interpretation. † We have shewn before, how little confidence their greatest Schoolmen had of this Doctrine; those who have stood the most stiffly for it, could never yet * agree how to explain these words, so as to prove it: And Cardinal Bellarmine alone, who reckons up the most part of their several ways, and argues the weakness too of every one but his own, may be sufficient to assure us, that they are never likely to be: And might serve to shew what just cause their own great * Catharinus had so long since to cry out, upon his Enquiry only into the meaning of the very first word, *This*: “Consider, says he, Reader, into what difficulties they are thrown, who go about to write upon this matter, when the word *THIS* only has had so many, and such contradictory Expositions, that they are enough to make a man lose his Wits, but barely to consider them all.

[Twas

'Twas this forced so many of their † greatest and most learned men before *Luther*, ingenuously to profess, That *there was not in Scripture any evident proof of this Doctrine*; and even *Cardinal Cajetan* since to own, That had not the Church determined for the *literal* sense of those words, *This is my Body*, they might have passed in the *Metaphorical*.

† See their Testimonies cited in the late *Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation*; in the *Defence of the Exposition of the Church of England*, p.

63, 64, 65. In

the Preface above, &c.]

It is the general acknowledgment of their || greatest Writers at this day, That if the Pronoun *THIS* in that Proposition, *This is my Body*, be referr'd to the *Bread*, which our Saviour Christ *beld* in his *Hand*, which he *blest*, which he *brake* and gave to his Disciples, and of which therefore certainly, if of any thing, he said *This is my Body*, the natural repugnancy that there is between the two things affirm'd of one another, *Bread* and *Christs Body*, will force them to be taken in a *figurative* Interpretation: For as much as 'tis impossible that *Bread* should be *Christs Body* otherwise than in a *figure*. And however, to avoid so dangerous a Consequence, they will rather apply it to *any thing*, nay to *nothing* at all than to the *Bread*; yet they would do well to consider, whether they do not thereby fall into as great a danger on the other side; since if the *Relative THIS* do's not determine those words to the *Bread*, 'tis evident that nothing in that whole Proposition do's; And then how those words shall work so great a change in a *Subject* to which

|| See *Bellarmin's* words in the *Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, pag. 56, 57. To which may be added, *Salmer. Tom. 9. Tr. 20. Suarez. Disp. 58. Sect. 7. Vasquez. Disp. 201. c. 1. &c.*

they have no manner of *Relation*, will, I believe, be as difficult to shew, as the change its self is incomprehensible to conceive.

And now after so plain an evidence of the weakness of that foundation which is by all confessed to be the chief, and has by many of the most Learned of that Church been thought the only Pillar of this Cause; I might well dispense with my self from entring on any farther examination of their other pretences to establish it. But because they have taken great pains of late to apply the † sixth Chapter of *St. John* to the Holy *Eucharist*, tho' it might be sufficient in general to say that no good Argument for a matter

† Concil. Trid.
Sess. xiii.

* See them thus ranged by
Albericus de Euch. lib. 1.
cap. 30. pag. 209. Two
Popes; Innocent III. Plus
II. Four Cardinals, Bona-
venture, D' Alliaco Cusan.
Cajetane. Two Archbishops,
Richardus Armachannus, &
Guenerius Granatenfis. Five
Bishops, Stephanus Eduen-
fis, Durandus Mimænsis,
Gulielmus Altifiodorensis,
Lindanus Ruremondensis,
& Janfenius Gandavensis.
Doctors and Professors of

Divinity in great abundance; Alexander Alenfis, Richardus de media villa, Jo. Ger-
son, Jo. de Raguso, Gabriel Biel, Thomas Waldensis, Author. tract. contr. perditionem
quorundam Bohemorum, Jo. Maria Verratus, Tilmannus Segebergensis, Athesanus,
Conradus, Jo. Ferus, Conradus Sasgerus, Jo. Hesselius, Ruardus Tapperus, Palacios,
& Rigaltius. Here are 30. of the *Roman Church*, who reject this Application of
this Chapter. For the *Fathers*, see the Learned *Paraphrase* lately set forth of this
Chapter, in the *Preface*: All which shews how little strength any Argument from this
Chapter can have to establish *Transubstantiation*.

It is a little surprizing in this matter, that they universally tell us, That neither the beginning nor ending of our Saviours Discourse in that Chapter belongs to this Matter; that both before and after that passage which they refer to, 'tis all *Metaphor*; only just two or three words for their purpose, *Literal*. But that which raises our wonder to the highest pitch, is, that the very fifty first *Verse* its self on which they found their Argument, is two thirds of it *Figure*, and only otherwise in one Clause to serve their *Hypothesis*.

" *I am*, says our Saviour, *the living Bread*
 " *which came down from Heaven*; This is Fi-
 " *gurative*: *If any man eat of this Bread*, he
 " *shall live for ever*: That is, they say, by a
 " *Spiritual Eating by Faith*: *And the Bread*
 " *which I will give, is my Flesh*, *which I will*
 " *give for the life of the World*. This only
 " must be understood of a *proper manducation*,
 " of a *real eating* of his *Flesh* in this Holy Sa-
 " *crament*.

It must be confessed, that this is an Arbitrary way of explaining indeed, and becomes the Character of a Church whose dictates are to be *received*, not *examined*; and may therefore pass well enough amongst those, with whom the supposed *Infallibility* of their *Guides*, is thought a sufficient dispensation for their own *private Consideration*. But for us, who can see no reason for this sudden change of our Saviours Discourse;
 nay

Of Transubstantiation.

may think that the connexion of that last Clause with the foregoing, is an evident sign that they all keep the same *Character*; and are therefore not a little scandalized at so *Capernaïtical* a Comment, as indeed "*Who can bear it ? V. 60.* They will please to excuse us, if we take our Saviours Interpretation to be at least of as good an Authority, as 'tis much more reasonable than theirs, *V. 62.* "*Do's this, says he, Offend you ? Do's my saying that ye must eat my flesh, and drink my Blood scandalize you ? Mistake not my design, I mean not any carnal eating of me; that indeed might justly move your Horror; " It is the Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit, and they are life.*

He that desires a fuller account of this Chapter, may please to recur to the late excellent † *Paraphrase* set out on purpose to explain it, and which will be abundantly sufficient to shew the reasonableness of that *Interpretation* which we give of it. I shall only add, to close all, that one Remark which * *Saint Augustine* has left us concerning it, and

so much the rather in that it is one of the rules which he lays down for the right Interpreting of Holy Scripture, and illustrates with this particular Example: "*If, says he, the saying be Preceptive, either forbidding a wicked action, or commanding to do that which is good, it is no Figurative saying: But if it seems to command any Villany,*

" or,

† A Paraphrase with Notes, and a Preface upon the Sixth Chapter of Saint John, Lond. 1686.

* De Doctrin. Christian. Lib. 3. Cap. 16.

“or Wickedness, or forbid what is profitable and good, it is Figurative. This saying, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you, seems to command a Villanous or Wicked Thing: It is therefore a FIGURE, enjoining us to communicate in the Passion of our Lord, and to lay it up in dear and profitable Remembrance, that his Flesh was crucifi’d and wounded for our sakes.

And now having thus clearly, I perswade my self, shewn the Weakness of those Grounds, on which this Doctrine of the *substantial Change* of the *Bread and Wine* into the *Body and Blood* of Christ in this Holy Sacrament is establish’d; I shall but very little insist on any other Arguments against it: Only in a Word, to demonstrate, that all manner of *Proofs* fail them in this great Error, I will in the close here subjoin two or three short *Considerations* more, to shew this *Doctrine* opposite, not only to *Holy Scripture*, as we have seen, but also,

1. To the best and purest *Tradition* of the Church.
2. To the *Right Reason*, and
3. To the *Common Senses* of all Mankind.

I. That

I. That this Doctrine is opposite to the best
and purest Tradition of the Church.

Now to shew this, I shall not heap together
a multitude of Quotations out of those Fathers,
through whose hands this Tradition must have
past: He that desires such an Account, may find
it fully done by one of the *Roman*

* A Treatise of Transubstantiation, by one of the Church of Rome, &c. Printed for Rich. Chiswell. 1687.

Communion, in a little * Treatise just now publish'd in our own Language. I will rather take a method that seems to me less liable to any just Exception, and that is to lay down some general

Remarks of undoubted Truth, and whose consequence will be as evident, as their certainty is undeniable. And,

I. For the Expressions of the Holy Fathers; It is not deny'd, but that in their popular Discourses they have spared no words (except that of *Transubstantiation*, which not one of them ever used) to set off so great a Mystery: And I believe that were the Sermons and Devotional Treatises of our own Divines alone, since the Reformation, searcht into, one might find Expressions among them, as much over-strain'd. * And

Such are μεταβολή, μεταρ' ὕμνησις, μεταλειτουργία, μετασχηματισμός, but never μετασίωσις. And Note, there is hardly any of these Words, which they have applied to the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, but they have attributed the same to the Water in Baptism.

* See Treatise first, of the Adoration, &c. Printed lately at Oxford; Which would make the World believe that we hold, I know not what imaginary Real Presence on this account; just as truly, as the Fathers did Transubstantiation.

doubtless

doubtless these would be as strong an Argument to prove *Transubstantiation* now the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as those to argue it to have been the Opinion of those Primitive Ages.

But now let us consult these men in their more exact composures, when they come to teach, not to declaim, and we shall find they will then tell us, That these Elements are for their * *substance* what they were before, *Bread and Wine*: That they retain the true *properties* of their nature, to *nourish* and *feed* the *Body*: that they are things *inanimate*, and void of *sense*: That with reference to the Holy Sacrament they are *Images, Figures, Signes, Symbols, Memorials, Types* and *Antitypes*, of the *Body and Blood* of Christ. That in their *Use* and *Benefit*, they are indeed the very *Body and Blood* of Christ to every faithful Receiver, but in a *Spiritual* and *Heavenly* manner, as we confess: That, in propriety of speech the *Wicked* receive not in this Holy Sacrament the *Body and Blood* of Christ, although they do outwardly press with their teeth the Holy Elements; but rather eat and drink the Sacrament of His *Body and Blood* to their damnation.

* It is not necessary to transcribe the Particulars here that have been so often and fully alledged. Most of these Expressions may be found in the Treatise of *Transubstantiation* lately published. The rest may be seen in *Blondel, Eclaircissements Familiers de la Controverse de l'Eucharistie*, Cap. iv, vii, viii. *Claude Rep. au 2. Traitté de la Perpetuité*, i. Part. Cap. iv, v. *Forbesius Instructiones Historico-Theolog. lib. xi. cap. ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, xv. Larrogue Histoire de l'Eucharistie*, liv. 2. cap. ii.

II. Secondly, For our Saviours words which are supposed to work this great Change, 'tis evident from the *Liturgies* of the *Eastern Church*,

K

that

This *Arcudius* himself is forced to confess of some of the latter *Greeks*, viz. That they take these Words only *ὁ μυστήριον*, Historically. See his Book de *Concord. Lib. 3. Cap. 27.* And indeed all the ancient Liturgies of that Church plainly speak it; However both He and *Goar* endeavour to shift it off; in which the Prayer of Consecration is after the words of Institution, and distinct from it. So in *Liturg. S. Chrysostom. Edition. Goar. pag. 96. n. 130. 132.* are pronounced the Words of Institution. Then *pag. 77. numb. 139.* the Deacon bids the Priest, *Ἐκθύνησον ἡμῶτα τὸν ἄγιον ἄρτον. Who thereupon thus consecrates it; He first signs it three times with the sign of the Cross, and then thus prays ὡς ποτε τὸν αἶμα ἄρτον ἔσται τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς χαρῆς τοῦ. And so the Cup afterwards.*

* The same seems to have been the custom of the *African Church*, whose Prayers now used, see in *Ludolph. Histor. l. 3. cap. 5.* Where is also the Expression mentioned, *n. 96. Hic Panis est Corpus meum, &c.*

that the *Greek Fathers* did not believe them to be words of *Consecration*; but to be the same in this Holy Eucharist that the *Haggadah*, or History of the *Passover* was in that ancient Feast; That is, were read only as an account of the *Occasion* and *design* of the *Institution* of this Blessed Sacrament, not to work any Miracles in the *Consecration*. And for the * *African Churches*, they at this day expound them in this very Sacrament after such a manner, as themselves confess to be inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*, viz. *This Bread is the Body of Christ.*

III. Let it be considered, *Thirdly*, That it was a great debate in the Primitive Church for above a thousand Years, Whether *Christ's Glorified Body* had any *Blood* in it or no? Now how

those Men could possibly have questioned whether *Christ's Glorified Body* had any *Blood* at all in it, had they then believed the *Cup* of *Eucharist* to have been truly and really chan-

See this whole matter deduced through the first Ages to *St. Augustine*, whom *Consentius* consulted about this very matter, in a particular Treatise written by *Monsieur Allix de Sanguine Christi*, 8vo: Paris 1680.

changed, into the *Blood* of his *Glorified Body*, as is now asserted, is what will hardly, I believe, be ever told us.

IV. We will add to this, *Fourthly*, their manner of opposing the *Heathenism* of the World. With what confidence could they have rallied them as they did, for worshipping gods which their own *Hands* had made? That had neither *Voice*, nor *Life*, nor *Motion*; Exposed to *Age*, to *Corruption*, to *Dust*, to *Worms*, to *Fire*, and other *Accidents*. That they adored gods which their *Enemies* could spoil them of, Thieves and Robbers take from them; which having no power to defend themselves, were forced to be kept under *Locks* and *Bolts* to secure them.

So Justin Martyr. Apol. 2. Tertul. Apolog. cap. 12. Arnobius, lib. 1. Minutius Felix. p. 26. Octav. Julius Firmicus, pag. 37. Edit. Lugdunens. 4to, 1652. Hieron. lib. 12. in Esai. St. Augustinus in Psal. 80. & in Psal. 113. Lactantius Instit. lib. 2. cap. 4. Chrysostom. Homil. 57. in Genes. &c.

For is not the Eucharistical *Bread* and *Wine*, in a higher degree than any of their *Idols* were, exposed to the same raillery? Had their *Waser*, if such then was their *Host*, any *voice*, or *life*, or *motion*? Did not their own *Hands* form its *substance*, and their *Mouths* speak it into a *God*? Could it defend its self, I do not say from publick *Enemies*, or private Robbers, but even from the very *Vermine*, the creeping things of the *Earth*?

Or should we suppose the Christians to have been so impudent, as notwithstanding all this, to expose others for the same follies of which

* And yet that none did, the Learned *Rigaltius* confesses. *Nor. ad Tertul.* l. 2. *ad Uxor.* c. 3.

† See *Tertul.* *Apol.* c. 21. *Et de carne Christi,* c. 4. 5. *Iustin Martyr,* *Apol.* 2. *Arnob.* l. 2. *Orig. contr. Cels.* l. 1.

themselves were more notoriously guilty; yet were there no * Heathens, that had wit enough to recriminate? The other † *Articles* of our Faith they sufficiently traduced; That we should worship a *Man*, and He too a Malefactor, crucified by *Pilate*; How would they have triumph'd, could they have added, That they worshipped a bit of *Bread* too;

which *Coster* himself thought a more ridiculous *Idolatry* than any the Heathens were guilty of? Since this Doctrine has been started, we have heard of the Reproaches of all sorts of Men, *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, against us on this account. || Were there no *Apostates*, that could tell them of this secret before? Nor any *Julian* that had malice enough to publish their Confusion? Certainly had the Ancients been the Men they are now endeavour'd to be represented, we had long ere this seen the whole World filled with the Writings that had proclaimed their shame, in one of the greatest instances of Impudence and Inconsideration, to attack their Enemies for that very Crime, of which themselves were more notoriously guilty.

|| See du Peron de l'Euchar. l. 3. c. 29. p. 973.

V. Nor does their manner of Disputing against the *Heretical* Christians any less speak their Opinion in this Point, than their way of Opposing the *Idolatry* of the Heathens. It was a great argument amongst them to expose the frenzy of *Eutyches*, who imagined some such kind of *Transubstantiation* of the humane nature of Christ into the Divine, to produce the Example of the *Eucharist*;

See this fully handled in a late treatise called, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared &c.* 1687.

Eucharist; That as there the Bread and the Wine, says P. Gelafius, "Being perfected by the Holy Spirit, pass into the Divine Substance, yet so as still to remain in the property of their own Nature, or substance of Bread and Wine; So here the Humane Nature of Christ still remains, though assumed by, and conjoynd to the Divine. Which words, as their Editor has done well to set a *Cautè* upon in the Margent to signifie their danger, so this is clear from them, that Gelafius, and so the other Writers that have made use of the same Argument, as St. Chrysostome, Theodoret, &c. must have thought the Bread and the Wine in the *Eucharist* no more to have been really changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ, than they did believe his Humane Nature to have been truly turned into the Divine; For that otherwise the parallel would have stood them in no stead, nay would have afforded a defence of that Heresie which they undertook to oppose by it.

VI. Yet more: Had the Primitive Christians believed this great *Change*; how comes it to pass, that we find none of those *Marks* nor *Signs* of it, that the World has since abounded with?

* No talk of *Accidents* existing without *Subjects*, of the *Senses* being liable to

This Argument is managed by St. Chrysostome Epist. ad Cesarium Monachum. By Theodoret Dial. 2. pag. 85 Ed G. L. Paris, 1642. Tom. 4. Gelafius in Opere contra Eutychen & Nestorium. He thus states the Eutychian Heresie, "Dicunt unam esse naturam. i. e. Divinam. Against this he thus disputes, Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis christi divina res est. — Et tamen non desinit substantia vel Natura Panis & Vini. — Satis ergo nobis Evidetur Ostenditur, hoc nobis de ipso Christo Domino sentiendum quod in ejus imagine proficemur. — Ut sicut in hanc sc. in divinam transeant S. Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanentes tamen in sua proprietate nature, sic, &c.

* See the contrary proved, that the Fathers did not believe this, by Blondel, de l'Euch. c. 8. Claude Rep.

au 2. Traite de la Perpetuite. part. 1. c. 4.

be *deceived* in judging of their proper *Objects*; in short, no *Philosophy* corrupted to maintain this Paradox. No *Adorations*, *Processions*, *Vows* paid to it, as to Christ himself. It is but a very little time since the † *Bell* came in play, to give the People notice that they should fall down and Worship this new God. The ‖ *Feast* in honour of it, is an Invention of Yesterday; the *Adoring* of it in the *Streets* no † older: Had not those first Christians respect sufficient for our Blessed Saviour? Or, did they perhaps do all this? Let them shew it us if they can; But till then, we must beg leave to conclude, That since we find not the least Footsteps of any of these necessary Appendages of this Doctrine among the Primitive Christians, it is not to be imagined that we should find the *Opinion* neither.

VII. But this is not all: We do not only not find any such Proofs as these of this Doctrine, but we find other Instances directly contrary to this belief. In some Churches they ‖ *burnt* what remained of the *Consecrated Elements*; * In others, they gave it to *little Children* to Eat: † In some, they buried it with their *Dead*; In all, they permitted the Communicants to carry home some *Remnants* of them; they sent it abroad by *Sea*, by *Land*, from

† Under Greg. ix. Ann. 1249. vid. Naucerum ad Ann. cit.

‖ Instituted by Urban iv. Ann. 1264.

∴ Indeed, in all Probability, a hundred years later.

‖ So in that of *Jerusalem*. See Helych. in Levitic. l. 2. c. 8.

* So in that of Constantinople. Evag. Hist. l. 4. c. 35.

† Vid. apud. Autor. Vir. Basilii, c. 8. in Vit. Pat. l. 1. This Custom was condemned in a Council at *Carthage*, Anno 419. Vid. Codic. Eccl. Afric. Justel. c. 18.

one Church and Village to another, without any Provision of Bell or Taper, Canopy or Incense, or any other mark of Adoration; they sometimes made \therefore *Poultices* of the Bread; they mix'd the \therefore *Wine* with their *Ink*; all which we can never imagine such holy Men would have presumed to do, had they indeed believed them to be the very *Body* and *Blood* of our Blessed Lord.

\therefore Vid. St. August. Oper. imp. contr. Julian. lib. 3. c. 164.

\therefore See an instance of this in *Baronius*, Ann. 648. Sect. 15. The 8th General Council did the same. In Act. Syn.

VIII. Lastly: Since the prevalence of this Doctrine in the Church, what *Opposition* has it met with? What *Schisms* has it caused? What infinite Debates have there risen about it? I shall not need to speak of the Troubles of *Berenger* in the Eleventh: Of the *Waldenses*, *Albigenses*, and others in the Twelfth Century. Of *Wickliff*, *Hus*, &c. who continued the Opposition; and finally, of the great *Reformation* in the beginning of the last Age; by all which this Heresy has been opposed ever since it came to any Knowledge in the Church. Now is it possible to be believed, that so many *Centuries* should pass, so many *Heresies* should arise, and a Doctrine so full of Contradictions remain uncontested in the Church for almost a Thousand years? That *Berenger* should be one of the first that should begin to Credit his *Senses*, to Consult his *Reason*, or even to Defend his *Creed*?

These

Of Transubstantiation.

These are Improbabilities that will need very convincing Arguments indeed to remove them.

This is the Foundation of the Authors of the Treatises, *De la Perpetuite*: Answered by Monf. Claude.

But for the little late *French* trick of proving this Doctrine necessary to have been received in the *Primitive Church*, because it is so in the *Present*, and if you will believe them, 'tis impossible a *Change* should have been made; I suppose, we need only turn the terms of the Argument to shew the Weakness of the Proof, viz. That from all these, and many other Observations, that might be offer'd of the like kind, 'tis Evident that this *Doctrine* at the beginning, was not believed in the *Church*, and let them from thence see, if they can conclude that neither is it believed now.

Thus contrary is this Doctrine to the Best and Purest *Tradition* of the Church: Nor is it less, Secondly,

II. To Right Reason too.

It were endless to heap together all the *Contradictions* that might be offer'd to prove this;

See Mr. Chillingworth against Kⁿor, c. iv. n. 46.

"That there should be *Length*, and nothing *Long*; *Breadth*, and nothing *Broad*; *Thickness*, and nothing *Thick*; *Whiteness*, and nothing *White*; *Roundness*, and nothing *Round*; *Weight*, and nothing *Heavy*; *Sweetness*, and nothing *Sweet*; *Moisture*, and nothing *Moist*; *Fluidness*, and nothing *Flowing*;

ing; many *Actions* and no *Agent*; many *Passions*, and no *Patient*; i. e. That there should be a *Long, Broad, Thick, White, Round, Heavy, Sweet, Moist, Flowing, Active, Passive NOTHING*. That *Bread* should be turned into the *Substance* of *Christ*, and yet not any thing of the *Bread* become any thing of *Christ*; neither the *Matter*, nor the *Form*, nor the *Accidents* of the *Bread*, be made either the *Matter*, or the *Form*, or the *Accidents* of *Christ*; that *Bread* should be turned into *Nothing*, and at the same Time with the same *Action* turned into *Christ*, and yet *Christ* should not be *Nothing*; that the same Thing at the same Time should have its just *Dimensions*, and just *Distance* of its *Parts* one from another, and at the same time not have it, but all its *Parts* together in one and the self-same *Point*; That the same Thing at the same time should be wholly *Above* its self, and wholly *Below* its self, *Within* its self, and *Without* its self, on the *Right-hand*, and on the *Left-hand*, and *Round-about* its self: That the same thing at the same time should *move* to and *from* its self, and yet *lie still*; or that it should be *carried* from one place to another through the middle space, and yet not *move*. That there should be no *Certainty* in our *Senses*, and yet that we should know something *Certainly*, and yet know nothing but by our *Senses*; That that which *Is* and *Was* long ago, should now *begin to be*; That that is now to be made of *Nothing*, which is not *Nothing*, but *Something*; That the same thing should be *Be-*

L

"fore

"fore and After its self. These and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, and most of them the avow'd Consequences of Transubstantiation, and I need not say all of them Contradictions to *Right Reason*.

But I shall insist rather upon such Instances as the Primitive Fathers have judged to be *absurd* and *impossible*; and which will at once shew both the Falseness and Novelty of this monstrous Do-

* See Examples of every one of these collected by Blondel, *Eclaircissements familiers de la controverse de l'Eucharistie*, cap. 8. p. 253.

ctrine; and such are these; * That a thing already existing should be produced anew: That a finite thing should be in many places at the same time; That a Body should be in a place, and yet take up no room in it; That a Body should penetrate the dimensions of another Body; That a Body should exist after the manner of a Spirit; That a real body should be invisible and impassible: That the same thing should be its self, and the figure of its self: That the same thing should be contained in,

† Monsieur Claude Rep. au.
2. Traite de la Perpetuite,
part. 1. c. 4. n. 51. p. 73.
Ed. 4^{to}. Paris 1668.

and participate of its self; † That an Accident should exist by its self without a Subject, after the manner of a Substance. All these things the primitive Fathers have declared to be in their

Opinions gross *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*, without making any exception of the Divine Power for the sake of the Eucharist, as some do now.

And indeed it were well if the impossibilities stopp'd here; but alas! the Repugnancies extend to

to the very *Creed* its self, and destroy the chiefest *Articles* of our *Faith*, the Fundamentals of Christianity. How can that man profess that he believes our Saviour Christ to have been *born* xvi. Ages since, of the *Virgin Mary*, whose very *Body* he sees the Priest about to make now before his Eyes? That he believes him to have *Ascended into Heaven*, and behold he is yet with us upon *Earth*? There to *Sit at the right hand of God the Father Almighty*, till in the end of the World *He shall come again with Glory to judg both the Quick and the Dead*? And behold he is here carried through the Streets; lock'd up in a Box; Adored first, and then Eaten by his own Creatures; carried up and down in several manners, and to several places, and sometimes *Lest out of a Priests Pocket*.

These are no far-fetch'd *Considerations*; they are the obvious Consequences of this Belief; and if these things are impossible, as doubtless, if there be any such thing as *Reason* in the World, they are; I suppose it may be very much the concern of every one that professes this Faith, to reflect a little upon them, and think what account must one day be given of their persisting obstinately in a point so evidently erroneous, that the least degree of an impartial judgment, would presently have shewn them the falseness of it.

But God has not left himself without farther witness in this matter; but has given us, *Thirdly*,

III. *The Conviction of our Senses against it.*

An Argument this, which since it cannot be Answered, they seem resolved to run it down ; as the *Stoick* in *Lucian*, who began to call names, when he had nothing else to say for himself.

But if the *Senses* are such ill *Informers*, that they may not be trusted in matters of this moment, would these Disputers please to tell us, What *Authority* they have for the truth of the *Christian Religion*? Was not Christianity first founded upon the *Miracles* of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles? Or were not the *Senses* judges of those *Miracles*? Are not the *Incarnation*, *Death*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension* of our Lord, the most Fundamental *Articles* of our Faith? Have we any other Argument to warrant our belief of these, but what comes to us by the ministry of our *Senses*? * Did not Christ himself appeal to them for the proof of his own *Rising*?

* John xx. 27,
29.

The *Romanist* himself believes *Transubstantiation* because he reads in the Scripture, or rather (to speak more agreeably to the method of their Church) because he has been told there are such Words there, as, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*: Now not to enquire how far those words will serve to warrant this Doctrine, is it not evident that he cannot

cannot be sure there are any such words there, if he may not trust his *Senses* : And if he may, is it not as plain, That he must seek for some other meaning than what they give of them ?

Let us suppose the change they speak of to be Supernatural ; Be it as much a *Miracle* as they desire : The very Character of a *Miracle* is to be known by the *Senses*. Nor God, nor Christ, nor any Prophet or Apostle, ever pretended to any other. And I shall leave it to any one to judge what progress Christianity would have made in the World ; if it had had no other *Miracles* but such as *Transubstantiation* to confirm it : *i.e.* Great Wonders confidently asserted, but such as every ones *sense* and *reason* would tell him were both falsely asserted, and impossible to be performed.

But now whilst we thus oppose the Errors of some by asserting the continuance of the Natural Substance of the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* in this Holy *Eucharist* ; let not any one think that we would therefore set up the mistakes of others ; as if this Holy *Sacrament* were nothing more than a meer *Rite* and *Ceremony*, a bare *Commemoration* only of Christ's Death and Passion.

Our Church indeed teaches us to believe, That the *Bread* and *Wine* continue still in their True and Natural *Substance* ; but it teaches us
also

See the Church Catechism, and Article Twenty eighth. The Communion-Office, &c.

also that 'tis the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, which every faithful Soul receives in that Holy Supper : *Spiritually* indeed, and after a *Heavenly manner*, but yet most *truly* and *really* too.

The Primitive Fathers, of whom we have before spoken, sufficiently assure us, that they were strangers to that *Corporeal change* that is now pretended ; but for this *Divine* and *Mystical*, they have openly enough declared for it.

Nor are we therefore afraid to confess a *change*, and that a very great one too made in this Holy *Sacrament*. The *Bread* and the *Wine* which we here Consecrate, ought not to be given or received by any one in this *Mystery*, as *common* ordinary food. Those Holy Elements which the Prayers of the Church have *sanctified*, and the Divine Words of our Blessed Saviour applied to them, though not *Transubstantiated*, yet certainly separated to a Holy use and signification, ought to be regarded with a very just Honour by us : And whilst we Worship Him whose Death we herein Commemorate, and of whose Grace we expect to be made partakers by it, we ought certainly to pay no little regard to the *Types* and *Figures*, by which he has chosen to represent the *one*, and convey to us the *other*.

Thus therefore we think we shall best divide our Piety, if we *Adore* our Redeemer in *Heaven*, yet omit nothing that may testify our just esteem of his

his Holy Sacrament on Earth: Nor suffer the most Zealous Votary for this new Opinion, to exceed us in our Care and Reverence of Approaching to his Holy Table.

We acknowledg him to be no less *Really Present*, tho after another *manner* than they; nor do we less expect to Communicate of his *Body* and *Blood* with our *Souls*, than they who think they take Him carnally into their *Mouths*.

Let our *Office of Communion* be examined; let the Reverence and Devotion, with which we Celebrate this Sacred Feast, be consider'd; all these will shew how far the Church of *England* is from a light esteem of this great *Mystery*; indeed, that it is impossible for any to set a higher Value and Reverence upon it.

I shall close this with the Declaration of One, who after many Years spent in great Reputation in their *Communion*, was so happy as to finish his Days in our *Church*; upon his first receiving the Blessed *Communion* among

us: “* *Tantum magnorum Præsulum de-*

missionem, tam eximiam Principum &

Populi Reverentiam, in Sacra Eucha-

ristia ministranda & recipienda, nus-

quam ego vidi apud Romanenses, qui tamen

se unos Sacramenti istius cultores jactant. That

He never saw in the Church of Rome, so great

a Reverence both in *Administring* and *Recei-*

ving this Holy *Eucharist*, as he found among us;

† info-

* Andr. Sallii Votum
pro pace, c. 23. p. 90. Ed.
Oxon. 1678.

Of Transubstantiation.

inſomuch, that he ſuppoſed it would hardly be believed among them, what from his own Experience, he recounted concerning it.

Vid. ibid. pag.
90. cap. xxiv.
n. 7.

Porro hæc quæ narravi & trita nimis ac vulgo nota Videbuntur fratribus noſtris Reformatæ Eccleſiæ: Nova omnino & fortè incredibilia Apparebunt Romanæ Congregationis Alumnis; quorum ſcilicet auribus perpetuò ſuggeritur per ſuos Inſtructores, nullam apud Proteſtantes exiſtere fidem præſentiæ Chriſti realis in Eucharistiæ Sacramento, nullam Devotionem aut Reverentiam in eo Sumendo.

And this may ſuffice for the *fiſt* thing propoſed; Of the *Doctrin* of *Transubſtantiation*, or of the *Real Preſence* profeſſed and eſtabliſhed in the *Church of Rome*. Our next Buſineſs will be to inquire:

II. What that *Real Preſence* of Chriſt in this Holy *Eucharist* is, which is acknowledged by the *Church of England*.

C H A P. II.

Of the Real Presence acknowledged by the Church of England.

IT may sufficiently appear from what has been said in the foregoing Chapter, what just reason we have to reject that kind of *Presence* which the *Church of Rome* supposes of Christ in this *Holy Eucharist*. But now in Answer to our Reflections upon them on this Occasion, a late Author has thought fit to make the World believe, that we our selves, in our Opinion of the *Real Presence*, are altogether as absurd as they are; and that the same Exceptions lie against our own *Church*, which we urge against *theirs*: All which, if it were true, would but little mend the matter, unless it may be thought sufficient for a man to prove, that he is not mad himself, because most of his Neighbours are in the same condition. Indeed herein he must be allowed to have reason on his side, that if the Case be so as he affirms, we, of all men living, ought not to press them with such *Contradictions*, as our own Opinion stands equally involved in.

Two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our B. Saviour in the Eucharist. Oxford. 1687.

Tract. I. pag. 15, 16.

* 'Tis true, he confesses for what concerns the *Church of England*, as it stood in the latter * end of King *Edward the 6th's* time, and as it may perhaps be thought to stand now, since the † *reviving* of the *Old Rubrick* † against the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament* at the end of our *Communion-Office*; it seems not to lye open to such a Recrimination: But taking our Opinion of the *Real Presence* from the Expressions of our own *Di-*

* Tract. I. §. 26.

† Ibid. §. 4.

Of the Real Presence acknowledged

vines, and of those abroad, such as *Calvin*, &c. whose
 “*Doctrine*, amongst all the rest, the *Church of England*
 “seems rather to have embraced and agreed with, es-
 “pecially since the beginning of the *Reformation* by
 “*Q. Elizabeth*; it plainly implies, “*That the very Sub-*
 “*stance of Christ's Body*; *That his Natural Body*,
 “*that very Body that was born of the Blessed Virgin*,
 “*and crucified on the Cross, is present as in Heaven*,
 “*so here in this Holy Sacrament, either to the worthy*
 “*Receiver, or to the Symbols*: which not only con-
 “tradicts the present Declaration of our Church; viz.
 “*That the Natural Body of Christ is not in in this bles-*
 “*sed Sacrament*; but will also lay a necessity upon us
 to quit our Reason too that we give for it; viz. “*That*
 “*it is against the Truth of a Natural Body to be in*
 “*more places than One at One time*; and on which we
 seem to found our Faith in this matter.

This is, I think, the design of the former of those
 Discourses lately Printed at *Oxford*, as to what con-
 cerns the Real Presence; and in Answer to which,
 that I may proceed as distinctly as possible, I shall re-
 duce my Reflections to these Four Generals:

1. What is the true Notion of the *Real Presence*, as
 acknowledged by the *Church of England*.
2. That this has been the Notion constantly main-
 tain'd by the Generality of our Divines.
3. That the *Alteration* of the *Rubrick*, as to this
 matter, was not upon any such difference in their
 Opinions, as this *Author* seems to surmise.
4. That the Reason alledged by it, concerning the
 Impossibility of Christ's *Natural Body's* existing in se-

several places at the same time, is no way invalidated by any of his Exceptions against it.

But before I enter on these *Reflections*, I cannot but observe the unreasonableness of our Adversaries, in repeating continually the same Arguments against us without either adding of any the least new force to them, or even taking notice of those Replies that have more than once been made against them. The *Publisher* of this *Treatise* has not been so indiligent an Observer of what has past under his Eyes, with reference to these kind of *Controversies*, as not to know, that this very *Objection*, which is the Foundation of his *First Discourse*, was made by his Old Friend T. G. above Nine Years since; and fully answer'd by his Reverend and Learned *Adversary*, not long after. And therefore that he certainly ought either quietly to have let alone this Argument already baffled, and not have put the World in Mind where that Debate stopp'd; or, at least, he should have added some new strength to it. But to send it again into the World in the same forlorn State it was before; to take no notice either from whose Store-house he borrow'd it, or what had been returned to it; This is in effect to confess, that they have no more to say for themselves: And 'tis a sad Cause indeed that has nothing to keep it up, but what they know very well we can answer, and that they themselves are unable to defend.

But to return to the *Points* propos'd to be consider'd: And,

First, To state the Notion of the *Real Presence*, as acknowledged by the *Church of England*.

1. Tract. p. 19.
§. 27.

Answer to T.
G's Dialogues.
Lond. 1679.
pag. 66.

I must observe, 1st. That our *Church* utterly denies our Saviour's *Body* to be so *Really Present* in the Blessed *Sacrament*, as either to leave *Heaven*, or to exist in *several places at the same time*. We confess, with this Author, that it would be no less a Contradiction for Christ's *Natural Body*, to be in several places at the same time by any other *Mode* whatsoever, than by that which the *Church of Rome* has stated; the repugnancy being in the *thing its self*, and not in the *manner of it*. 2^{dly}, That we deny that in the Sacred *Elements* which we receive, there is any other *Substance* than that of *Bread and Wine*, distributed to the Communicants; which alone they take into their Mouths, and press with their Teeth. In short, "All which the *Doctrine of our Church* implies by this Phrase, is "only a *Real Presence* of Christ's Invisible Power and "Grace, so in and with the *Elements*, as by the faithful receiving of them, to convey *Spiritual* and *real Effects* to the Souls of Men. As the *Bodies* assumed by Angels, might be called their *Bodies*, while "they assumed them; or rather, as the *Church* is the "Body of Christ, because of his Spirit quickening and "enlivening the Souls of Believers, to the *Bread* and "*Wine*, after *Consecration*, are the *Real*, but the *Spiritual* "and *Mystical Body* of Christ.

Thus has that learned Man, to whom T. G. first made this Objection, stated the Notion of the *Real Presence* profess'd by us; and that this is indeed the true *Doctrine* of the *Church of England* in this matter, is evident not only from the plain words of our *xxviii. Article*, and of our *Church Catechism*; but also from the whole Tenour of that *Office* which we use in the celebration of it. In our *Exhortation* to it, this Blessed Eucharist is expressly called "The Commu-
"nion

“*nion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour Christ: We are told, “that if with a true Penitent Heart “and lively Faith we receive this Holy Sacrament; “then we *Spiritually* eat the *Flesh* of Christ, and *drink* “his *Blood*. When the Priest delivers the consecrated *Bread*, he bids the Communicant “Take and eat this “in Remembrance that Christ died for thee, and *feed* “on him in thy *Heart* by Faith with Thanksgiving. In our Prayer after the Receiving, “We thank God, “for that he doth vouchsafe to feed us who have duly “received these Holy *Mysterics*, with the *Spiritual* “food of the most precious *Body* and *Blood* of his “Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and doth assure us “thereby of his favour and goodness towards us, and “that we are very Members, incorporate in the *Mystical* “*Body* of his Son. All which, and many other the like Expressions, clearly shew, that the *Real Presence* which we confess in this Holy *Eucharist* is no other than in St. Pauls Phrase, a *Real Communion* of Christ’s *Body* and *Blood*; or as our Church expresses it *Article* xxviii. “That to such as rightly and worthily, and with Faith “receive the same, the *Bread* which we break is a partaking of the *Body* of Christ, and likewise the *Cup* of *Blessing* is a partaking of the *Blood* of Christ.

Hence it was that in the Prayer of *Consecration* in King Edward vi. time, the *Church* of England after the Example of the ancient *Liturgies* of the *Greek Church* used that Form, which our Author observes to have been since left out. “And with thy Holy Spirit vouch- Tra&I. 2.
“safe to Bless and Sanctifie these thy Gifts and Crea-
“tures of *Bread* and *Wine*, that they may be unto us
“the *Body* and *Blood* of thy most dearly beloved Son
“Jesus Christ — *i.e.* as the Sense plainly implies, may
Communicate to our Souls all the Blessings and Gra-

ces

Pag. 3.

ces which Christ's *Body* and *Blood* has purchased for us; which is in Effect the very same we now pray for in the same Address— "Hear us, O Merciful Father we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy Creatures of *Bread* and *Wine*, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in remembrance of his Death and Passion, may be *partakers* of his most Blessed *Body* and *Blood*. Between which two Petitions there is so near an Affinity, that had not our Author been very desirous to find out *Mysteries* where there are indeed none; He would hardly have suffer'd his *Puritan* Friend to have lead him to make so heavy a complaint, about so small a Variation.

I will not deny but that some Men may possibly have advanced their *private Notions* beyond what is here said: But this is I am sure all that our *Church* warrants, or that we are therefore concern'd to defend. And if there be indeed any, who as our Author here expresses it, do believe Christ's *natural Body* to be as in *Heaven*, so in the Holy Sacrament; they may please to consider how this can be reconciled with the *Rubrick* of our *Church*, "That the natural *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour Christ are in *Heaven* and not *here*, it being against the truth of Christ's *natural Body*, to be at one time in *more places* than one.

In the mean time I pass on to the next thing I propos'd,

Secondly, To shew in Opposition to the Pretences of our *Adversary*, that this has been the *Notion* of the *Real Presence* constantly maintain'd by our most Learned and Orthodox Divines.

And

And here, because our *Author* has thought fit to appeal not only to our own, but to the forreign Divines for this new Faith which he is pleas'd to impose upon us, viz. "That the very Substance of Christs *Tract. 1. §. 7.*
 " *Body*, that his *natural Body*, that that very *Body* that
 " was born of the Blessed Virgin, and crucified on
 " the Cross, &c. is present, as in *Heaven*, so *Here* in
 " this *Holy Sacrament* ; i. e. in both at the same time:
 I must be content to follow his Steps, and enquire into the Doctrine first of Mr. *Calvin* and his followers ; next of our own Country-men in this Particular.

And first for Mr. *Calvin*, and his followers, I cannot but observe what different charges are brought against them in this matter. On the one hand we are told by *Becanus* the *Jesuit*, that, " *The Calvinists, says * Calvinistæ
 " he, deny the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ to be truly, negant corpus
 " really, and substantially present in the *Eucharist* : On & sanguinem
 the other, Here is one will prove, that they believe Christi, verè,
 his very *Body*, his *natural Body*, now in *Heaven*, to be realiter, &
 nevertheless at the same time in the *Holy Sacrament*. substantialiter
 It were to be wish'd that they would let us once know præsentem esse
 what 'tis they will stick to, and not by such contradictory charges shew to all the World, that both their in Eucharistiâ.
Accusations may be false, but that it is utterly impossible they should both be true. *Becani manuale. l. 3. c. 9. p. 501. Ed. Luxemburgi. 1625.*

And indeed in this very instance they are both *CALVIN*.
 false ; The *Calvinists* hold neither the one or other of these Extreame. In the Edition of his *Institutions* printed at *Basil* 1536. Mr. *Calvin* thus delivers his Opinion, of the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ in the *Holy Eucharist*. "We say, that they are truly and Efficac-

exhiberi non autem naturaliter. Quo scilicet, significamus non substantiam ipsam corporis, seu verum & naturale Christi corpus illic dari, sed omnia quæ in suo corpore nobis Beneficia Christus præstitit. EA est corporis PRÆSENTIA quam Sacramenti ratio postulat. Edit. Basil. 8°. 1536. Dicimus verè & Efficaciter

ciously

* Dilucida explicatio &c. Contra Westphalum. Edit. Anno 1561.

† Christi corpus non modò semel fuisse datum in salutem nostram, dum ad expianda peccata immolatum in cruce fuit, sed quotidie nobis in alimentum porrigi, ut dum ipse habitat in nobis, bonorum etiam ejus omnium societate fruamur.— Apud Hospin. Hist. Sacram. Part. 2da Ann. 1561. p. 477.

† Rursum alimentum à nobis vocatur hoc sensu, quia incomprehensibili spiritus Virtute nobis vitam suam inspirat ut sit nobis communis, non secus atque à radice arboris vitalis succus in ramos se diffundit, vel à capite in singula membra manat Vigor. Ibid.— Inprimis obstaculum de corporis immensitate submovere necesse est. Nisi enim constet finitum esse calòq; comprehendi nulla erit dissidii conciliandi Ratio— p. 478. Christus sicuti in gloriam cœlestem semel est receptus, ita lecorum intervallo quoad carnem, est à nobis diffusus; Divinà autem Essentià & virtute, gratià etiam spirituali cælum & terram implere.— Idem ergo Corpus quod semel filius Dei Patri in sacrificium obtulit, quotidie nobis in Cœna offert, ut sit in Spirituale Alimentum. Tantùm de modo tenendum est, non opus esse descendere carnis Essentià è cœlo ut eà pascamur, sed ad penetranda impedimenta & superandam locorum distantiam sufficere Spiritus virtutem.— Commenta procul facessant; qualia sunt de Corporis ubiq; ubiq; vel de occultà sub panis symbolo inclusione, vel de substantiali ejus in terris presentia. Hospin. p. 478. Hæc omnia refert ex illo Calvini loco.

“ ciously exhibited to us, but not *naturally*: By which
“ we signifie, not that the *very Substance* of his *Body*,
“ or that the *true and natural Body* of Christ are given
“ there, but all the *Benefits* which Christ did for us in
“ his *Body*. THIS is that *PRESENCE* of his *Body*, which
“ the nature of the *Sacrament* requires.

But because I do not find these words in the *Editions* of that Book since, least any one should thereupon conclude that he had also changed his Opinion; we may observe the very same delivered by him in *another of his Books, and which will be so much the more considerable, in that it was written purposely for the clearing of this matter. Now in this he affirms, “ † That
“ Christ's *Body* was not only once given for our Salvation, but is also every day reached out to us for our
“ Sustenance, that so, whilst he dwells in us, we may
“ also enjoy the Fellowship of all his goods.— Then he explains How Christ is our *food*, viz. † because
“ by the incomprehensible Virtue of the *Holy Spirit*,
“ he inspires his Life into us, that he may communicate it to us, no less than the vital juice is diffused
“ from the Root into all the Branches of the Tree, or
“ than Vigour flows from the *Head* into all the members.— He declares Christ's *Body* to be *finite*, and en-

closed

"closed in *Heaven*; and therefore as to his *Flesh* to
 "be distant in place from us.— That it is not necessary
 "that the *Essence* of his *Flesh* should descend from
 "*Heaven*, that we may be fed with it, but that to re-
 "move all such impediments, and overcome the di-
 "stance of places, the *Virtue* of the *Spirit* is sufficient—
 "In short, that all *inventions* contrary to this are to be
 "rejected, such as, The *Ubiquity* of Christ's Body,
 "the *inclosing* of it under the *Symbol* of *Bread*, and
 "his *Substantial presence* upon *Earth*.

By all which it sufficiently appears, that Mr. *Calvin* B E Z A.
 * See Hospin.
 Hist. Sacram.
 Part. 2. §1
 Ann. 1561.
 p. 515. Edit.
 Genev. 1581.
 Comment. de
 statu Relig. &
 reipub. in
 Gallia ad Ann.
 1561. p. 112.
 Et postea pag.
 138. Ita se ex-
 primit in eun-
 dem planè
 sensum "affir-
 mamus 7. c.
 adesse in usu
 Cœnar, in quâ
 nobis offert,
 dat & verè ex-
 hibet Corpus
 was no friend to our Authors Fancy; but evidently
 explained the *Real Presence* after that *Spiritual man-
 ner* we have before laid down.

For *Beza*, and the rest as he calls them, of the *same*
Set; we cannot better learn their Opinion than from
 the *Acts* of the *Colloquy of Poissy*, and which chiefly
 lay upon this *Point*. At this *conference* the most eminent
 Men of the *Calvinian Party* were assembled; the first
 of them which spoke, was *Beza*: In that part of his
 Discourse which referr'd to the *Holy Eucharist*, his
 words were much like those which our Author has
 quoted out of him. And by his own *Exposition* of
 them, we shall be better able to judg of his meaning,
 than by his *Adversaries Gloss*. " * We do not say that

suum & sanguinem suum operatione Spiritus Sci. nos verò recipimus, edimus & bibimus
 spiritaliter & per fidem illud ipsum corpus quod pro nobis mortuum est, edimq; illum san-
 guinem pro nobis effusum. Edit. Ann. 1577. 8°. Beze. Hist. Eccles. pag. 595. 596.

For all this see *Beza's* own History ad Ann. 1561. p. 524. And when in the Conference
D' Espenè pressed them with departing from *Calvin*; *Beza* declared, that they were not at
 all contrary to him: That for the word *Substance*, which he sometimes used in expressing
 Christ's *Real Presence*, it was only to signify, that they did not feign any *imaginary Body*
 of Christ, or *fantastick reception or communion* of His *Body* in this *Holy Supper*; But
 that for the rest, they all believed, that no one could participate of him otherwise than
Spiritually and by *Faith*, not in taking Him into the Mouth, or eating him with the
 Teeth. See pag. 595. Ibid.

"in the Eucharist there is only a *commemoration* of the
 "death of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor do we say, that
 "in it we are made *partakers* only of the *fruits* of
 "his *death* and *passion*; but we joyn the *ground* with
 "the *fruits*, affirming with St. Paul, that the *Bread*
 "which by Gods appointment we break, is the *parti-*
 "*cipation of the Body of Christ* crucified for us; the
 "*Cup* which we drink, the *Communion of the true Blood*
 "that was shed for us; and that *in the very same Sub-*
 "*stance which he received in the Womb of the Virgin,*
 "*and which he carry'd up with him into the Heavens.*—
 Then descending to the *Popish* Doctrine of *Transub-*
stantiation: "It overthrows, *says he*, the *truth* of
 "Christ's *Humane nature* and of his *Ascension* — So
 little did he suppose, that Christ's *natural Body* could be
 at the same time both in *Heaven* and in the *Sacrament*.
 Hereupon he explains himself yet farther; — "But
 "now if any one should ask of us, whether we make
 "Christ *absent* from the *Holy Supper*? We answer,
 "By no means. But yet if we respect the *distance* of
 "place (as when we speak of his *Corporal presence*, and
 "of his *Humanity*, we must) we affirm, *says he*, that
 "Christ's *Body* is as far distant from the *Bread* and
 "*Wine*, as *Heaven* is from *Earth*— If any one shall
 "from thence conclude, that we make Christ *absent*
 "from the *Holy Supper*, he will conclude amiss: For
 "this Honour we allow to God, that though the *Body*
 "of Jesus Christ be now in *Heaven* and *not elsewhere*,
 "and we on *Earth* and *not elsewhere*, yet are we made
 "*partakers* of his *Body* and *Blood* after a *spiritual man-*
 "*ner*, and by the means of *Faith*.

Thus do's Beza in like manner expound their Do-
 ctrine of the *Real Presence*, by a *real communion* of
 Christ's *Body* and *Blood*, and flatly condemns our Au-
 thors

thors invention, of his *natural Bodie's* being either in *PETER* the *Symbols*, or any where else upon *Earth*. The *MARTYR* same is the account which † *Peter Martyr* in the same *confe-*

rence gave of it; and of whom

* *Esspensius*, one of the *Popish* delegates, confels'd "That no Di-
"vine of that time had spoken
"so clearly and distinctly con-
"cerning this *Sacrament*, as he
"did. And however ∴ *Gene-*
brard safely pretends that the o-
ther *Protestants* dissented from

him, yet 'tis certain they were so far from it, that they all Subscribed the very same Paper out of which he read his Declaration. But I will close this with the same words with which these *Protestants* did their final resolution in the *Colloquy* as to this matter; "We
"affirm that no *distance of place* can hinder the *Com-*
"munion which we have with Christs *Body and Blood*;
"because the Supper of the Lord is a Heavenly thing,
"and though upon Earth we receive with our mouths
"Bread and Wine, viz. the true *Symbols* of his *Body*
"and *Blood*; yet by *Faith*, and through the Opera-
"tion of the *Holy Spirit*, our Souls (of which this is

† Respondeo pro mea parte, Corpus Christi non esse Verè et substantialiter alibi quàm in Cælo. Non tamen inficior Christi corpus verum, & sanguinem illius Verum quæ pro salute humana tradita sunt in Cruce, fide spiritualiter percipi in Sacra Cœnâ. *Histoire Eccles. de Beze. liv. 4. p. 606.*

Anno 1561.

* Vid. Hist. de Beze ib. p. 599. Comment. de stat. rel. p. 140. ad Ann 1561. *Hospin. pag. 518.*

∴ See *Hospin.* of this whole matter pag. 520.

Affirmamus nullam locorum distantiam impedire posse communicationem quam habemus cum Christi corpore & sanguine, quoniam Cœna Domini

est res cœlestis; et quamvis in terrâ recipimus ore panem & vinum, vera scil. Corporis & sanguinis signa; tamen fide & spiritûs sancti operatione mentes nostræ (quarum hic est præcipue cibus) in cælum elatæ perfruntur corpore & sanguine præsentè. Et hæc respectu dicimus, Corpus verè se pani conjungere, & sanguinem vino; non aliter tamen quam sacramentali ratione, neque locali neque naturali modo, sed quoniam Efficaciter significant Deum illa dare fideliter communicantibus, illòsque fide verè & certo percipere. *Hospin. l. c. Comm. ibid. p. 142. Ubi subjicitur* "Hæc est perspicua de Corporis & sanguinis J. C. Præsentia in Sacramento Cœnæ Ecclesiarum Reformatarum sententia—
Beze Hist. Eccles. pag. 615. where he adds, that they reject not only Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, but also toute maniere de presence par laquelle le corps de Christ n'est colloqué maintenant reellem. ni ailleurs qu'au ciel. And then adds, why they thus use the word substance in this matter, and what they mean by it. See pag. 515. ad Ann 1561.

Of the Real Presence acknowledged

“the chief food) being carry’d up into Heaven, enjoy the *Body* and *Blood* present. And in this respect we say that the *Body* do’s truly joyn its self to the *Bread*, and the *Blood* to the *Wine*, but yet no other-wise than *Sacramentally*, neither after a *local* or *natural manner*. But because they do effectually signify, that God gives them to the Faithful Communicants, and that they do by Faith truly and certainly receive them.

And thus far I have consider’d the forreign Divines produced by our *Author*, and in which we find the very same Explication which our *Church* gives of the *Real presence*. For our own Authors, I shall insist the rather upon them, both to take off any impression which the scraps here put together by those whose business it is to represent their own *Sence*, not their *Authors*, might otherwise be apt to make upon some Men; and also to shew the exact concord there has been ever since the *Reformation* amongst us as to this matter.

Now for what concerns our *Divines* in King *Edward* viths. time, we have our Authors own confession, that towards the latter end of the Reign of that excellent Prince, they seem to have deny’d any such *Real* and *Essential presence* as he would fasten upon those of Queen *Elizabeth’s* after. “For as the first days of this Prince, says he, seem to have been more addicted to *Lutheranism*, so the latter days to *Zwinglianism*; as appears in several expressions of Bishop *Ridley* and *Peter Martyr*. And indeed the *Articles* agreed upon in the *Convocation* at *London* 1562. plainly shew it; in the xxixth. of which we find this express Clause; “Since the very being of humane *Nature* doth require that the *Body* of one and the same

“same man cannot be at one and the same time in
 “*many places*, but of necessity must be in some cer-
 “tain and determinate *place*; Therefore the *Body* of
 “*Christ* cannot be present in *many* different *places* at
 “the same time. And since, as the Holy Scriptures tes-
 “tify, *Christ* hath been taken up into *Heaven*, and
 “there is to abide till the end of the World, it be-
 “cometh not any of the faithful to believe or profess,
 “that there is a *Real* or *Corporal* Presence, as they
 “phrase it, of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in the
 “*Holy Eucharist*. I shall therefore produce only a
 Witness or two of this *King's* Reign; and so pass on to
 those that follow.

And 1st, A. B. *Cranmer* in his Answer to *Gardiner*, Bishop of *Winchester*, objecting to him, That he deny'd the Presence of *Christ* in this *Holy Eucharist*, replies, That it was “a thing he never said nor thought.
 “—My book in divers places saith clean contrary, Answer to
 “That *Christ* is with us *spiritually present*; is eaten and *Gardiner*, Bi-
 “drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, although shop of *Win-*
 “*Corporally* he be departed out of this World, and chester, Fol.
 “gone into *Heaven*, pag. 5.—As he giveth *Bread* London, 1551.
 “to be eaten with our *Months*, so giveth he his very Pag. 5.
 “*Body* to be eaten with our *Faith*. And therefore I
 “say, that *Christ* giveth himself truly to be eaten,
 “chawed and digested; but all is *spiritually* with *Faith*,
 “not with *Mouth*, pag. 9.—As the washing out- Pag. 9.
 “wardly in Water is not a vain Token, but teacheth
 “such a washing as God worketh inwardly in them
 “that duly receive the same; so likewise is not the
 “*Bread* a vain Token, but sheweth and preacheth to
 “the godly Receiver, what God worketh in him by
 “his Almighty Power secretly and invisibly. And
 “there.

Assertio vera
& Catholica
Doctrina de
Sacramento
Corporis &
Sanguinis, J.
Christi Serva-
toris nostri. Li-
br. 8vo. 1601.

" therefore as the *Bread* is outwardly eaten indeed in
 " the Lord's Supper, so is the *very Body* of Christ in-
 " wardly by *Faith* eaten indeed of all them that come
 " thereto in such sort as they ought to do; which
 " eating nourisheth them unto Everlasting Life. And
 in his Treatise of the *Holy Sacrament*, Lib. 3. where
 he sets himself particularly to state this very Question,
How Christ is present in this Holy Sacrament, He de-
 clares, Cap. 2. " That whereas the *Papists* suppose
 " Christ to be under the *Species* of *Bread* and *Wine*;
 " we believe him to be in those who worthily re-
 " ceive these *Holy Elements*. They think him to be
 " received by the *Mouth*, and to enter with the *Bread*
 " and *Wine*; We assert, that he is received only by
 " the *Soul*, and enters there by *Faith*. That Christ is
 " present only *sacramentally* and *spiritually* in this sa-
 " cred *Mystery*, p. 116. That since his *Ascension* into
 " *Heaven*, he is *there*, and not on *Earth*, p. 118. and
 " that he cannot be in both together, 128.—In
 " short, he gives us this Rule for interpreting the Ex-
 " pressions of the *Fathers*, where it is said, That we
 " eat the *flesh*, and drink the *blood* of *Christ*; That
 " we receive in the *Holy Sacrament*, the *very body*
 " that hung on the *Cross*, &c. cap. 14. p. 180. These,
 " says he, and other Expressions of the like kind (which
 " speak Christ to be upon *Earth*, and to be received
 " of Christians by eating or drinking), are either to be
 " understood of his *Divine Nature* (which is every
 " where); or else must be taken *figuratively* or *spiri-*
 " *tually*. For he is *figuratively* only in the *Bread* and
 " *Wine*; and *spiritually* in those that receive this *Bread*
 " and *Wine* worthily. But *truly*, and as to his *Body*
 " and *Flesh*, he is in *Heaven only*; from whence he shall
 " come to judge the quick and the dead.

Thus

Thus did this Learned and Holy *Martyr* understand our Doctrine of the *Real Presence*; and the same was the *Idea* which his Companion both in *Doctrine* and *Suffering*, Bishop *Ridley*, has left us of it. In his Discourse of the *Lord's Supper*, pag. 33. he tells us, "That the *Substance* of the *Bread* continues as the *Matter* of this *Sacrament*; but so, that by reason of its change, as to *Use*, *Office* and *Dignity*, it is turned *Sacramentally* into the *Body* of *Christ*; as in *Baptism*, the *Water* is turned into the *Laver* of *Regeneration*—That the *Humane Nature* of *Christ* is in *Heaven*, and cannot in *any manner* lye hid under the form of *Bread*, p. 34.—Then he enquires, whether therefore we take away the *Presence* of *Christ's Body* from the *Sacrament*? p. 35. And utterly denies, that this is either said or thought by him. The *Substance* of the true *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, says he, is always in *Heaven*, nor shall it depart thence before the end of the *World*. Now this *Substance* of his *Body* and *Blood* being conjoyned to his *Divine Nature*, has not only *Life* in it self, but can, and is wont to bestow it upon all those who partake of it, and believe in his *Name*.—Nor is it any hindrance to this, that *Christ* still remains in *Heaven*, and that we are upon *Earth*. For by *Grace*, that is, *Life* (as *S. John* interprets it, c. 6) and the *Properties* of it, as far as may be profitable to us in this our *Pilgrimage* here below, he is with us to the end of the *World*. As the *Sun*, who though he never leaves his *Orb*, yet by his *Life*, *Heat*, and *Influence*, is present to us: pag. 36, 37.

Hitherto then there can be no doubt, but that both the *Church* and the *Divines* knew no other *Real Presence* than what has been before acknowledged to be

Bp. RIDLEY.

Ridley de Cæ-
nâ Dominicâ
Assertio; Ge-
nue apud J.
Crispinum.
1556.

I. Tract. §. IV.
pag. 4.

I. Treatise.
pag. 2. §. I.
and again, p.
22. §. XXXI.

be still our *Doctrine*. We must now go on to the times of tryal, the days of *Q. Elizabeth*, and her Successors, when our Author supposes, "that Men of different Judgments had the Power. Now for proof of this, besides the Expressions of particular Men, which we shall presently consider, we have Two General Presumptions offer'd to us; One, "That *Dr. Heylin*, and "others, have observed, *he says*, of this Queen, that "he was a *zealous propugner* of the *Real Presence*; which may be very true, and yet but little to the purpose, if she *propugned* it in the same sense that her Brother King *Edward the 6th*, and the *Church of England* had done before, and not in the new Notion imposed upon her by this Author, but without any manner of proof to warrant his suggestion. The other, "That "upon the Re-view made by her Divines of the *Common-Prayer* and *Articles*, they struck out of the One "the *Rubrick* against the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament*, "and the Passage before mention'd (being of the same "temper as the Declaration in the *Liturgie*), out of the "*xxixth Article*; and which has accordingly been omitted ever since.

And here I cannot but again take notice of the dissingenuousness of this Author, in dissembling the true Account that has so largely been given by our late accurate Compiler of the *History* of our *Reformation* of this whole matter, only for the advancing so pitiful an Insinuation of what I dare appeal to his own Conscience whether he did not know to be otherwise. I will beg leave to transcribe the whole Passage; and shall then leave it to the indifferent Reader to judge whether a man so well acquainted with Books, and so interested in this matter, could have lived so long in the world without bearing

ing of so eminent a matter in our *Church-History* as this.

The Author is treating about the difference between the *Article* establish'd in King *Edward* the six's time, and those in *Q. Elizabeth's*.

Dr. Burnet's
Hist. of the
Reformation,
Vol 2. Pag.
405. Ann.
1559. Edit. 2.
1683.

"In the *Article* of the Lord's Supper there is a great
"deal left out; For instead of that large Refutation
"of the *Corporal Presence*, from the Impossibility of a
"Bodies being in more places at once; from whence it
"follows, That since Christ's *Body* is in *Heaven*, the
"Faithful ought not to believe or profess a *Real or Cor-*
"poral *Presence* of it in the Sacrament. In the new
"Article it is said, [*That the Body of Christ is given*
"and received after a *spiritual manner*; and the means
"by which it is received, is *Faith*.] But in the Original
"Copy of these *Articles*, which I have seen subscribed
"by the Hands of *All* that sat in either House of *Con-*
"vocation, there is a further *Addition* made. The *Ar-*
"ticles were subscribed with that precaution which was
"requisite in a matter of such consequence: For be-
"fore the *Subscriptions* there is set down the Number
"of the *Pages*, and of the *Lines* in every *Page* of the
"Book to which they set their Hands.

MSS. C. Cor.
Christ. Cant.

* In that *Article* of the *Eucharist* these words are ad-
ded; "Christ when he ascended into *Heaven* made his
"Body Immortal, but took not from it the *Nature* of a
"Body: For still it retains, according to the Scriptures,
"the *Verity* of a *Humane Body*; which must be always
"in *One definite place*, and cannot be spread into ma-
"ny, or all places at Once. Since then Christ being
"carry'd up to *Heaven*, is to remain there to the end of
"the *World*, and is to come from thence, and from
"no place else (as says *S. Austin*) to judge the Quick
"and the Dead: None of the Faithful ought to be-

An Explanati-
on of Christ's
Presence in the
Sacrament.

O

"lieve

Of the Real Presence acknowledged

“*lieve or profess the Real, or (as they call it) the Corporal Presence of his Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist.*

“But this in the *Original* is dash’t over with *minium* ; yet so that it is still legible. The Secret of it was this ; The *Queen* and her *Council* studied (as hath been already shewn) to unite all into the *Communion* of the *Church* : And it was alledged, that such an express *Definition* against a *Real Presence*, might drive from the *Church* many who were still of that *Perswasion* ; and therefore it was thought to be enough to condemn *Transubstantiation*, and to say, that Christ was present after a *spiritual manner*, and received by *Faith*. To say more, as it was judged suspicious, so it might occasion division. Upon this these words were by common consent left out. And in the next *Convocation* the *Articles* were subscribed without them ; of which I have also seen the *Original*.

“This shews, that the *Doctrine* of the *Church* subscribed by the whole *Convocation*, was at that time contrary to the belief of a *Real or Corporal Presence* in the *Sacrament* ; only it was not thought necessary or expedient to publish it. Though from this silence, which flowed not from their *Opinion*, but the *Wisdom* of that time, in leaving a Liberty for different *Speculations*, as to the *manner* of the *Presence* ; *SOME* have since inferr’d, that the chief Pastors of this *Church* did then disapprove of the *definition* made in *King Edwards* time ; and that they were for a *Real Presence*.

Thus that Learned *Historian*. And here let our *Adversary* consider what he thinks of this Account ; and whether after so evident a Confutation from plain
mat-

matter of Fact of his Objection before it appear'd, we may not reasonably complain both of his Weakness and In-sincerity; neither to take any notice of such a plain History of this whole Transaction, or to imagine that to vain a Surmise of Q. Elizabeth's being a great *propugner of the Real Presence*, would be sufficient to obviate so clear and particular an Account of this matter.

But though this might suffice to shew the continuance of the same *Doctrine* of the *Real Presence* in this *Queen's*, that was before profess'd in her Brother's Reign; yet it may not be amiss to discover a little further the truth of this matter, and how falsely this Author has alledged those great Names he has produced. I will therefore beg leave to continue my Proof, with an Induction of the most Eminent of our *Divines* that I have at this time the Opportunity to consult, to our own days.

And first for Bishop *Jewel*; though the part he had in the *Convocation* before mention'd, may sufficiently assure us of his Opinion; yet it may not be improper to repeat the very words of a Person of his Learning and Eminence in our *Church*. In his Reply to *Harding* thus he expresses the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of England, as to the *Real Presence*: "Whereas Mr. *Harding* thus unjustly reporteth of us, that we maintain a *naked Figure*, and a *bare Sign* or *Token* only, and nothing else——He knoweth well, we feed not the People of God with *bare Signs* and *Figures*, but teach them, that the *Sacraments* of Christ be Holy *Mysteries*; and that in the Ministrations thereof Christ is set before us even as he was crucified upon the Cross. —— We teach the People, not that a *naked Sign* or *Token*, but that Christ's *Body* and *Blood*

Bp. JEWEL.

Vth Article of the *Real Presence* against *Harding*, pag. 237. Lond. 1611.

See also his Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, pag. 215, &c.

“indeed and verily is given unto us ; that we verily eat
 “it ; that we verily drink it ; that we verily be relie-
 “ved and live by it : that we are Bones of his Bones,
 “and Flesh of his Flesh ; that Christ dwelleth in us, and
 “we in him : — Yet we say not, either that the Sub-
 “stance of the Bread and Wine is done away, or that
 “Christ’s Body is let down from Heaven, or made Re-
 “ally or Fleshly present in the Sacrament. We are
 “taught according to the Doctrine of the Old Fathers,
 “to lift up our Hearts to Heaven, and there to feed
 “upon the Lamb of God — Thus spiritually and
 “with the Mouth of our Faith we eat the Body of
 “Christ, and drink his Blood ; even as verily as his Bo-
 “dy was verily broken, and his Blood verily shed upon
 “the Cross — Indeed the Bread that we receive with
 “our Bodily Mouths, is an earthly thing ; and therefore
 “a Figure ; as the Water in Baptism is likewise also a
 “Figure. But the Body of Christ that thereby is repre-
 “sented, and there is offer’d unto our Faith, is the thing
 “it self, and not Figure. To conclude, Three things
 “herein we must consider : 1st, That we put a diffe-
 “rence between the Sign and the thing it self that is
 “signified : 2. That we seek Christ above in Heaven,
 “and imagine not him to be present Bodily upon the
 “Earth : 3. That the Body of Christ is to be eaten by
 “Faith only, and none otherwise.

I shall not trouble the Reader with any more of our
 Mr. HOOKER. Divines who lived in the beginning of this Queen’s
 Reign, and subscribed the Article before-recited ; but
 pass on directly to him whom our Author first menti-
 ons, the Venerable Mr. Hooker, and whose Judgment
 having been so deservedly esteemed by all sorts of men,
 ought not to be lightly accounted of by us.

Tr. I. cap. 2. §.
 10. Pag. 6.

And

And here I must observe, that this Learned Person is drawn in only by a Consequence, and that no very clear one neither, to favour his Opinion. The truth is, he has dealt with Mr. *Hooker* just as himself, or one of his Friends has been observed to have done on the like occasion with the incomparable *Chillingworth*; has pick'd up a Passage or two that seemed for his purpose; but dissembled whole Pages in the same place that were evidently against him. For thus Mr. *Hooker* in the Chapter cited by him, interprets the words of *Institution*: "If we doubt, says he, what those admirable words may import, let him be our Teacher for the meaning of Christ, to whom Christ was himself a School-master. Let our Lord's Apostle be his Interpreter; content we our selves with his Explication; *My Body, the Communion of my Body; My Blood, the Communion of my Blood.* Is there any thing more expedite, clear and easie, than that as Christ is termed our Life, because through him we obtain Life: So the parts of this Sacrament are his *Body* and *Blood*, because they are *Causes* instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the participation of his *Body* and *Blood* ensueth? — The *Real Presence* of Christ's most blessed *Body* and *Blood* is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy Receiver of the Sacrament — And again, p. 310. he thus interprets the same words; This Hallow'd Food through the concurrence of Divine Power, is in verity and truth unto faithful Receivers instrumentally a Cause of that *mystical participation*, whereby as I make my self wholly *theirs*, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving Grace as my sacrificed *Body* can yeild, and as their *Souls* do presently need. *This is* to them and in them *my Body.*

And

Difference between the Protestant and Socinian Methods, in answer to the Protestants Plea for a Socinian, pag. 54.

Bishop
ANDREWS.
1 Tract. pag.
7. §. xi. n. 1.

† Habemus
Christum præ-
sentem ad
Baptismatis
Sacramentum,
habemus eum
præsentem ad
Alcaris Cibus
& Potum. *Au-
gustin.* Stola,
quæ est Eccle-
sia Christi, la-
vatur in ipsius
sanguine vivo
i. e. in lavacro
regeneratio-
nis. *Origen.*
Statim bap-
tizatus in san-
guine agni
Vir meruit
appellari.
Hieron. Chri-
sti sanguine
lavaris, quan-
do in ejus
mortem Bap-
tizaris. *Leo.*
P. &c.

See Sermon
vii. on the
Resurrect. pag.
454. Sermon
Lond. 1541.

And this may suffice in Vindication of Mr. *Hooker*. Those who desire a fuller Account, may find several Pages to the same purpose in the Chapter which I have quoted. The next our Author mentions, is the Learned Bishop *Andrews*, in that much noted passage, as he calls it, in the Answer to *Bellarmino*.

And indeed we need desire no other Passage to judge of his Opinion in this matter; in which 1st. He utterly excludes all defining any thing as to the *manner* of Christs *Presence* in the *Eucharist*. 2. He professes that a *Presence* we believe, and that no less a *True* one than the *Papists*. 3. He plainly insinuates that the *presence* of Christ in the *Eucharist*, was much the same as in *Baptism*; the very allusion which the Holy † Fathers were wont to make, to express his *Presence* by in this Holy Sacrament; which since our Adversaries can neither deny, nor yet say is so *real*, as to be *Essential* or *Corporeal*; they must of necessity allow that there may be a *true Presence* (which is all the Bishop affirms) without such a *Substantial* one as this Author here contends for.

But to shew that whatever this Bishop understood by the *Real presence*, it could not be that Christs *glorified Body* is now actually *present* in this Sacred *Mystery*, will appear demonstratively from this, that he declares it is not this *Body* which we either *Represent* or *partake* of there; insomuch that he doubts not to say, that could there be a *Transubstantiation*, such as the *Church of Rome* supposes, it would not serve our turn, nor answer the design of this *Sacrament*. 'Tis in his Sermon on 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. "We will mark, *saith he*, something more: That *Ephulemur* doth here "refer to *Immolatus*: To Christ not every way *con-* "der'd, but *As* when he was *Offer'd*. Christs *Body* "that

"that now is, true; But not Christ's Body as now it is, but
 "as then it was, when it was offer'd, rent, and slain,
 "and sacrificed for us. Not as now he is glorified;
 "for so he is not; he cannot be *Immolatus*; For as he
 "is, he is immortal and impassible; But as then he was
 "when he suffer'd death, that is *passible* and *mortal*.
 "Then in his *passible* State, he did institute this of
 "outs, to be a memorial of his *Passible* and *Passion* both.
 "And we are in this Action not only carry'd up to
 "Christ (*sursum Corda*) [so that Christ it seems is not
 "brought down to us] but we are also carry'd back to
 "Christ, as he was at the very instant, and in the
 "very Act of his offering. So, and no otherwise, doth
 "this Text teach; So, and no otherwise do we Repre-
 "sent him. By the incomprehensible power of his E-
 "ternal Spirit, not He alone, but He as at the very
 "act of his offering is made present to us, and we in-
 "corporate into his death, and invested in the Benefits
 "of it. If an *Host* could be turned into him now
 "glorified as he is, it would not serve; Christ offer'd is
 "it. Thither must we look; to the *Serpent* lift up:
 "thither we must repair; even *ad Cadaver*: We must
 "Hoc facere, do that is then done. So and no other-
 "wise is this *Epulare* to be conceived. And so I think
 "none will say they do or can turn him.

Whatsoever *Real* presence then this Bishop believed,
 it must be of his crucified Body, and as in the State of
 his death; and that I think cannot be otherwise present
 than in one of those two ways mentioned above by
 Arch-Bishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly
 acknowledge; either *Figuratively*, in the *Elements*;
 or *Spiritually*, in the Souls of those who worthily
 receive them.

And from this Account of Bishop Andrew's Opini-
 on

AS AUBON,
KING
JAMES,
A. Bishop of
Spalato.

See the 1. Tra.
§. xi. note 2.
pag. 7.
* Vol. 3. de
Rep. Eccles.
lib. 7. cap. 11.
pag. 200. 201.

Coloss. ii. 9,
17.

See Hammond
in Coloss. 1.
Annot. d.

Arch-Bishop
LAWD.

1 Tract. §. xiv.
pag. 8.

† Bishop
HALL.

* MONTAGUE
Origenes Eccles.
Tom. prior.
par. poster.

p. 247. 249. 250. &c. Panis in Synaxi fit corpus Christi; — Sed et Corpus Christi
CREDENIES hunc. Ad eundem utrumque modum & mensuram; sed non Naturaliter; —
Itaque nec Panis I T A est Corpus Christi; Mystice tantum, non Physice. vid. plur.

Bilson

on, we may conclude what it was that *Casanbon* and *King James* understood by the *Real Presence*, who insist upon that Bishops words to express their own Notion and meaning of it. Nor can we make any other judgment of the Arch Bishop of *Spalato*; who in the next §* to that cited by our Adversary is very earnest against those who receive *unworthily* this Holy Sacrament, and by consequence ties not Christs *natural Body* to the *Bread*; and declares it to be after a *Spiritual imperceptible* and *miraculous* manner. As for the term *Corporaliter*, which he there uses, and which *Melancthon* and some others had used before him, that may be well enough understood in the same Sence, as *verè* or *realiter*; and is often so used both in *Scripture* and in the *Holy Fathers*. As when *St. Paul* says of Christ, that in "*Him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead Bodily*"; that is *really*, in opposition to the *Shechinah* or *Presence* of God in the *Tabernacle*. And again, *The Body of Christ*; that is the *substance*, the *reality*, opposed to the *types* and *figures* of the Law. And so in the *Hebrew Exposition* *וְגוֹ* is often used for *Essence* as well as *Body*, and applied to *Spiritual* as well as *Corporal* things.

Nor can I see any more reason to understand Arch-Bishop *Lawd* in any other Sence. He asserts the *true* and *real Presence* of Christ in this Sacred Feast; but he do's not say, that Christ's *natural Body* which is now in *Heaven*, is also in this *Holy Sacrament*, or in the *worthy receiver*; nor have we any reason to believe that he understood it so to be. * And the same must be said of † Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Montague*, and Bishop

Bilson; in whose expressions as they are quoted by our Author, I find nothing that proves the Sence he would impose upon them; and whose works had I now by me, I might possibly be able to give some better account of them. Though after all, should one of these in his violence against his Adversaries, or the others in their *pacifick design* of reconciling all Parties as to this Point, have said more than they ought to do, I do not see but that it ought to have been imputed to the circumstances they were in and the designs they pursued, rather than be set up for the measure either of their own, or our Churches Opinion.

MONTAGUE
BILSON.

And now I am mentioning these things, I ought not pass over one other eminent instance of such a charitable undertaking, and which has given occasion to our Author of a Quotation he might otherwise have wanted, in that excellent Bishop of St. Andrews Bishop *Forbes*; concerning whose Authority in this matter I shall offer only the censure of one, than whom none could have given a more worthy Character of a person, who so well deserved it as that good Bishop did; "I do not deny, but his earnest desire of a general Peace and Union among all Christians, has made him too favourable to many of the Corrupti-
"ons in the Church of *Rome*: But though a Charity
"that is not well ballanced, may carry one to very
"in iscreet things; yet the principle from whence
"thdy flow'd in him, was so truly good, that the Er-
"rors to which it carry'd him, ought to be either ex-
"cused, or at least to be very gently censured.

Bishop
FORBES.

Author of the
Life of Bishop
BEDEL;
in the Pre-
face.

There remain now but two of all the Divines he has produced to prove his new fancy, which he would set up for the *Doctrine* of the Church of England; and those as little for his purpose as any he has hitherto

P

mentioned;

Bishop
TAYLOR.

Polemical discourses. p.
182. London.
1674.

mentioned; Bishop Taylor and Mr. Thorndyke. For Bishop Taylor, I cannot acquit our Author of a wilful prevarication; since it is evident that he has so plainly opposed his Notion, and that in the very Book he quotes, and which he wrote on purpose to shew our meaning of the *Real Presence*, that he could not but have known that he *misrepresented* him. I shall set down the state of the Question as it is in the beginning of that *Treatise*. "The *Doctrine of the Church of England*, and generally of the *Protestants* in this *Article* is; That after the Minister of the Holy Mysteries hath rightly pray'd and blessed or consecrated the *Bread* and the *Wine*; the *Symbols* become changed into the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ after a *Sacramental*, i. e. in a *Spiritual Real* manner. So that all that worthily communicate, do by *Faith* receive Christ *Really, Effectually*, to all the purposes of his Passion — It is *Bread* and it is *Christ's Body*: It is *Bread* in *Substance*, Christ in the *Sacrament*; and Christ is as *really* given to all that are truly dispos'd, as the *Symbols* are p. 183. — It is here as in the other *Sacrament*; for as there *natural Water* becomes the *laver of Regeneration*; so here *Bread* and *Wine* become the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ: but there and here too the first *Substance* is changed by *Grace*, but remains the *same* in *nature* — We say that Christ's *Body* is in the *Sacrament really*, but *Spiritually*. They (the *Papists*) say it is there *really*, but *Spiritually*. For so *Belarmin* is bold to say that the word may be allowed in this Question. Where now is the difference? Here; By *Spiritually* they mean present after the manner of a *Spirit*; by *Spiritually* we mean present to our *Spirits only*; that is, as Christ is not present to any other Sense but that of *faith* or *spiritual* susception — "They

“ They say that Christs *Body* is *truly* present there, as
 “ it was upon the *Cross*, but not after the *manner* of all,
 “ or any *Body*— But we by the *real Spiritual Presence* of
 “ Christ, do understand Christ to be present, as the Spi-
 “ rit of God is present in the Hearts of the faithful, by
 “ *Blessing* and *Grace* ; and this is *ALL we mean* besides
 “ the *tropical* and *figurative* presence.

Such is the Account which that Excellent Bishop here gives not only of his own but, as he expressly terms, it of the *Church of England's*, and the *Generality of the Protestants Belief in this Matter*. Our Author's dissimulation of it is so much the more inexcusable, by how much the more zealous an Advocate he makes him of his Cause, when all this that I have transcribed, was in the very same Section, and almost in the same Page with what he has cited. For his little Remark upon the Title of the Bishops Book, where he calls it of the *Real Presence* and *Spiritual*, whence he would infer a difference between the two Terms, and find something *Real* that is not *Spiritual* in this *Sacrament* ; it is evident that the Design of that Distinction was this : There be several sorts of *Real Presences* ; the *Papists*, the *Lutherans*, the *Church of England*, all allow a *Real Presence* in the *Sacrament*, but after different *Manners* ; it was therefore necessary to add somewhat more, to shew what kind of *Real Presence* he undertook to maintain, and he knew no word more proper to express it by than *Spiritual*, which does not therefore imply a Distinction from, but Limitation of the other Term *Real*. And thus he explains it, N. 6. and 7. of that Section, where he shews that the *Spiritual* is also a *Real Presence*, and indeed more properly so than any other. In short, thus he concludes the State of the Question, in the same Section,

Treatise 1st.
p. 20th.

Page 183.

Page 186.

on, between us and the *Church of Rome*, so that now, says he, The Question is not, "Whether the Symbols be changed into Christ's Body and Blood or no? For it is granted on all sides: But whether this Conversion be Sacramental and Figurative? Or whether it be Natural and Bodily? Nor is it whether Christ be taken Really, but whether he be taken in a Spiritual or in a Natural Manner? We say the Conversion is Figurative, Mystical, and Sacramental; they say, it is Proper, Natural, and Corporal. We affirm that Christ is really taken by Faith, by the Spirit, to all real Effects of his Passion (this is an Explication a little different from our Authors) "They say he is taken by the Mouth, and that the Spiritual and the Virtual taking him in Virtue or Effect, is not sufficient, tho' done also in the Sacrament. *Hic Rhodus, hic Salus.*

If this does not yet satisfy him that he has injured this Learned Man in the Representation of his Opinion, directly contrary to his Sense, I will offer him yet one Passage more, taken from another part of his Works, and which, I hope, will thoroughly convince him. It is in the 5th. Letter, to a Gentleman that was tempted to the Communion of the *Church of Rome*. He had proposed to the Bishop this Question. "Whether, without all danger of Superstition or Idolatry, we may not render Divine Worship to our Blessed Saviour, as present in the Blessed Sacrament or Host, according to his Humane Nature, in that Host? The Question is certainly every way pertinent to our present Purpose; let us see what the Answer is that he makes to it. "We may not render Divine Worship to him as present in the Blessed Sacrament according to his Humane Nature, without danger of Idolatry, because he is not there according to his Humane Na-

ture,

"*true*, and therefore you give Divine Worship to a
 " *Non-Ens*, which must needs be *Idolatry*. Well, but
 still it may be the Bishop does not intend to exclude
 the *Corpus Domini*, but only the *Corporal* or *Natural*
Manner of that *Body*: Let us therefore hear how he
 goes on. "For *Idolum nihil est in mundo*, saith
 " *St. Paul*, and Christ as *Present* by his *Humane Nature*
 " in the *Sacrament* is a *Non-ens*. For it is not true;
 " there is no such thing. What, not as Christ there, no
 way as to his *Humane nature*?—No, he is saith the
 " *Bishop*, present there by his *Divine power*, and his
 " *Divine Blessing*, and the *Fruits* of his *Body*, the real
 " *effective Consequents* of his *Passion*; but for any other
 " *Presence*, it is *Idolum*; it is nothing in the World. A-
 " dore Christ in Heaven; for the Heaven must contain
 " him till the time of restitution of all things. This then
 is Bishop Taylor's Notion of the *Real Presence*: and
 now I am confident our Author himself will remit him
 to the Company of those Old *Zuinglian* Bishops, *Cran-*
mer, *Ridley*, and the rest, who lived before that *Q.*
Elizabeth had propugned the *Real Presence* of his new
 Model into the Heads of the *Governours* of the Church
 of England.

And now I am afraid his Cause will be desperate
 unless Mr. *Thorndyke* can support it. And how
 unlikely he is to do it, he might have learnt from
 what has been answered to *T. G.* on the same Occasion.
 ∴ *T. G.* Had in his first *Dialogue* quoted the same place
 which our Author has done since, to prove his belief
 of the *Real Presence*: His * *Adversary* confesses this, but
 produces another that explains his meaning; "† if
 " it can any way be shew'd, says he, that the Church
 " did ever pray what the *Flesh* and *Blood* might be substi-
 " tuted instead of the Elements under the Accidents of
 " them

Treat. 1st.
 Pag. 10.

Mr. THORN-
 DYKE.

∴ *T. G.* Dia-
 logue 1st.

Pag. 21.

* Answer to
T. G.'s Dial.

Pag. 92.

† THORN-

DYKE Laws
 of the Church.
 Ch. 4. Pag. 30.

"them, then I am content that this be accounted
 "henceforth the *Sacramental presence* of them in the
 "*Eucharist*. But if the *Church* only prays that the Spi-
 "rit of God coming down upon the *Elements*— may
 "make them the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, so that
 "they which receive them may be filled with the *Grace*
 "of his *Spirit*; then is it not the Sence of the *Catholick*
 "*Church* that can oblige any man to believe the abo-
 "lishing of the *Elements* in their *bodily substance*, be-
 "cause supposing that they remain, they may never-
 "theless come to be the instruments of Gods Spirit
 "to convey the operation thereof to them that are di-
 "spos'd to receive it, no otherwise than his *Flesh* and
 "*Blood* convey'd the *Efficacy* thereof upon Earth. And
 "that I suppose is reason enough to call it the *Body*
 "and *Blood* of Christ *Sacramentally*, that is to say, as in
 "the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*.

Thus Mr. *Thorndyke* expresses himself as to the *Real*
Presence: But yet after all, I will not deny but that
 this Learned Person seems to have had a particular No-
 tion in this matter, and which is far enough from what
 our *Author* would fix upon him. He thought that the
Elements by *Consecration* were united to the Godhead
 of Christ, much after the same manner as his *Natural*
Body was by *Incarnation*; and that so the very *Ele-*
ments became after a sort his *Body*. "The *Church*
 "from the beginning did not pretend to consecrate by
 "these bare words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*,
 "as operatory in changing the *Elements* into the *Body*
 "and *Blood* of Christ; but by that Word of God
 "whereby he hath declared the Institution of this Sa-
 "crament, and commanded the use of it; and by the
 "Execution of this Command. Now it is executed,
 "and hath always been executed by the Act of the
 "Church

See his Just
 Weights and
 Measures, 4^{to}.
 Lond. 1662.—
 Pag. 94.

“*Church* upon God’s Word of *Institution*, praying
 “that the Holy Ghost coming down upon the present
 “*Elements*, may make them the *Body* and *Blood* of
 “*Christ*. Not by *changing* them into the *Nature* of
 “*Flesh* and *Blood*; as the *Bread* and *Wine* that nou-
 “rished our Lord *Christ* on Earth, became the *Flesh*
 “and *Blood* of the Son of God, by becoming the *Flesh*
 “and *Blood* of his Manhood, *Hypostatically* united to
 “his *Godhead*, saith *Gregory Nyssene*. But immediate-
 “ly and *ipso facto*, by being united to the *Spirit* of
 “*Christ*; *i. e.* his *Godhead*. For the *Flesh* and *Blood*
 “of *Christ* by *Incarnation*, the *Elements* by *Consecra-*
 “*tion* being united to the *Spirit*; *i. e.* the *Godhead* of
 “*Christ*, become both one *Sacramentally*, by being both
 “one with the *Spirit* or *Godhead* of *Christ*, to the con-
 “veying of God’s *Spirit* to a Christian.

And thus have I consider’d the several *Divines* pro-
 duced for this new Conceit concerning the *Real Pre-*
sence; and shewn the greatest part of his Authors to be
 evidently against it; some not to have spoken so clear-
 ly that we can determine any thing concerning them;
 but not one that favours what they were alledged for;
viz. to shew that they believed *Christ’s Natural Body*
 to be both in *Heaven* and in the *Sacrament*; only after
 another manner than the *Papists*. It were an easie mat-
 ter to shew how constant our *Church* has been to the
Doctrine of the true, real, spiritual *Presence* which it
 still asserts, and which it derived from its first *Refor-*
mers, whose words have been before set down by a cloud
 of other Witnesses; as may be seen by the short *Speci-*
men I have put together in the * *Margent*. But I have in-
 sisted too long already on this matter; and shall therefore
 pass on to the *Third* thing I proposed to consider; *viz.*

* Reformatio
 legum Eccles.
 ex Authorit.
 Henr. 8. &
 Edw. 6. Lond.

1641. Tit. de Sacram. cap. 4. pag. 29. — Morton de Euch. part. 2. Class. 4. cap. 1. §. 2.
 pag. 224. Lat. 1640. 4to. — Fr. White against Fisher, pag. 407. Lond. 1624. Fol. — A.

E. Usher’s.

B. Usher's Answer to a Challenge, c of the *Real Presence*, p. 44, 45. *London*, 1625. — Id. Sermon before the House of Commons, pag. 16, 19, &c — Dr. Hammond *Pract. Catech.* part. ult. Answer to this Question; the Importance of these words, *That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received*; p. 135. Edit. *London*. Vol. 1684. — Dr. Jackson's Works, Tom. 3. pag. 300, 302. *London*. 1673. Dr. J. White's Way to the True Church. *London*, 1624. §. 51. N. 10 pag. 209. *Cofens Hist. Transubst.* p. 3, 4, 12, &c. Edit. *London*, 1675. 8vo.

Thirdly, That the *Alterations* which have been made in our *Rubrick*, were not upon the account of our Divines changing their Opinions, as is vainly and falsely suggested.

To give a rational Account of this Affair, we must carefully consider the Circumstances of the Times, the Tempers and Dispositions of the Persons that lived in them; and what the Designs of the *Governing Parties* were with reference to them; and then we shall presently see both a great deal of Wisdom and Piety in the making of these *Alterations*; allowing the Opinions of those who did it, to have continued, as we have seen, in all of them the same.

When first this *Rubrick* was put into King *Edward's* Liturgy, the *Church of England* was but just rising up out of the Errors and Superstitions with which it had been over-run by the prevalency of *Poper*y upon it. It had the happiness to be reformed, not as most others were, by private persons, and in many places contrary to the desires of the *Civil Power*; but by a Unanimous Concurrence of the Highest Authority both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical*, of *Church* and *State*. Hence it came to pass, that *Convocations* being assembled, *Deliberations* had of the greatest and wisest Persons for the proceeding in it, nothing was done out of a Spirit of Peevishness or Opposition; the *Holy Scriptures* and *Antiquity* were carefully consulted; and all things examined according to the exactest measures that could be taken from them; and a diligent distinction made of what was

was *Popery*, and what *true* and *Catholick Christianity*, that so the One only might be rejected, the other duly retained.

Now by this means it was that the Ancient Government of the Church became preserved amongst us; a just and wise *Liturgy* collected out of the *Publick Rituals*: Whatever *Ceremonies* were requisite for Order or Decency, were retain'd; and among the rest, that of receiving the *Communion kneeling* for One, which has accordingly ever since been the manner establish'd amongst us. But that no Occasion of Scandal might hereby be given, whether to our Neighbour-Churches abroad, or to any particular Members of our own at home: That those who were yet weak in the Faith, might not either continue or fall back into Error, and by our retaining the same Ceremony in the *Communion* that they had been used to in the *Mass*, fancy that they were to adore the Bread as they did before: For all these great Ends this Caution was inserted; that the true Intent of this Ceremony was only for Decency and Order; not that any Adoration was thereby intended, or ought to be done unto any Real or Essential Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood, which were not there, but in Heaven, it being against the Truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at One time in more places than One.

And this is sufficiently intimated in the words of the Rubrick to have been the first Cause and Design of it. Thus it continued the remainder of King Edward's time: But now Queen Elizabeth being come to the Crown, there were other Circumstances to be consider'd. Those of the Reformed Religion abroad were sufficiently satisfied, both by this publick Declaration, which had stood so many years in the *Liturgy* of our

Q

Church;

Church; and by the Conversation and Acquaintance of our Divines, forced by the dispersion in the foregoing Reign, to seek for refuge among their Brethren in other Countries, of our Orthodox Faith, as to this Point. Our own Members at home had heard too much of this matter in the publick Writings and Disputations, and in the constant Sufferings of their *Martyrs*, not to know that the *Popish Real Presence* was a meer Figment, an *Idolum*, as Bishop Taylor justly styles it; and their *Mass* to be *abhorred* rather than *adored*. There was then no longer need of this *Rubrick* upon any of those Accounts for which it was first establish'd; and there was a very just reason now to lay it aside. That great *Queen* desired, if possible, to compose the Minds of her Subjects, and make up those Divisions which the differences of *Religion*, and the late unhappy Consequences of them had occasion'd. For this, she made it her business to render the publick Acts of the *Church of England* as agreeable to all Parties as Truth would permit. The Clause of the *Real Presence* inserted in the *Articles* of her first *Convocation*, and *subscribed* by all the *Members* of it (to shew that their belief was still the same it had ever been as to this matter) was nevertheless, as we have seen, struck out for this end their next Session. The Title of *Head of the Church*, which her Father had first taken, her Brother continued, and was from both derived to her, so qualified and explained, as might prevent any Occasion of quarrelling at it by the most capitious persons. That Petition in the *Litany* inserted by King Henry viii. "*From the Tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable Enormities, Good Lord, &c.*" struck out: And in conformity to what was done in the *Articles* as to this Point, this *Rubrick* also was omitted, lest it should give *Offence* to those who were still

zealous for their mistaken Principles and Worship. This was the Wife and Christian Design of that Excellent *Princess*; and how happy an Effect this Moderation might have had, if the Bishop of *Rome* had not by his Artifice and Authority with some of her Subjects, prevented it, the first Years of her Reign sufficiently shew.

Thus was the Occasion and Reason of its omission in *Q. Elizabeth's* time, as great as the necessity of its first Insertion in *King Edward's*. And in this state it continued all the Reign of that *Queen*, and of her two Successors, *King James* and *King Charles. 1st*, I shall not need to say by what means it was, that new Occasion was given for the reviving of it. We have all of us heard, and many of us seen too much of it. How Order became Superstitious, and Decency termed Idolatry: The *Church of England* traduced as but another Name for *Popery*; and this *Custom of kneeling at the Communion*, one of the strongest Arguments offer'd for the Proof of it. And now when Panick Fears had found such prevalence over the Minds of Men, as to destroy a King, and embroil a Kingdom into a *Civil War*, of almost Twenty Years continuance; and tho by the good hand of God our King and our Peace were again restored, yet the minds of the People were still unsettled, and in danger of being again blown up upon the least Occasion; what could be more advisable to justify our selves from all suspicion of *Popery* in this matter, and in Juce them to a *Conformity* with us in a *Ceremony* they had entertain'd such a dread of, than to revive that ancient *Rubrick*; and so quiet the Minds of the People now, by the same means by which they had been seiled and secured before?

This I am perswaded is so *rational* an Account, as will both justify the proceedings of our Governours in

Q 2

these

these Changes, and shew the dis-ingenuity of those, who not only knowing, but having been told these things, will still rather impute it to an imaginary wavering, or uncertainty of Opinion, than to a necessary and Christian Accommodation to the Times. For the change in the Prayer of *Consecration*, I have already said, that 'tis in the Words, not the Sense: And if our Governours thought the present Expressions liable to exception than the former, they had certainly reason for the Alteration. For the other Exceptions there is very little in them, whether the Minister lay his Hand on the Sacred Elements, when he repeats the words of *Institution*, as at this time, or only consecrates them by the Prayers of the *Church*, and the Words of Christ, without any other *Ceremony*, as heretofore: Whether with the *Church of Rome* we use only the words of Christ in the distribution; or with most of the Reformed Churches, the other Expression, "*Take and eat this*, &c. or (as we chuse rather) joyn them both together: Whether we sing the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*—before or after the receiving; but because the chiefest Mystery he thinks lies in this, That whereas in King *Edward's* days the *Rubrick* called it an *Essential Presence*, which we have now turned into *Corporeal*; I must confess I will not undertake to say what the Occasion of it was; if they thought this latter manner more free from giving Offence than the other would have been, I think they did well to prefer it. Let every one entertain what Notion he pleases of these things; this I have shewn is the Doctrine of the *Church* which we all subscribe, "That the *Natural Body* and "*Blood* of our Saviour Christ are in *Heaven*, and not *here*; i. e. in the Sacrament; and if there can be any other *Real Presence* than such as I have shewn to have been the

con-

constant belief of our Divines consistent with this *Rubrick*, I shall no more desire to debar any one the belief of it, than I shall be willing to be obliged to believe it with him.

And now after so clear an Account as I have here given of the several changes that have been made in our *Rubrick*, were I minded to recriminate, and tell the World what Alterations have been made in their Mass, & those in Points infinitely more material than any thing that can be alledged against us, I much question whether they would be able to give us so good an account of it. And something of this I may perhaps offer as a *Specimen* of the wisdom of this Author in the choice of his Accusation before we part; In the mean time I go on to the last thing propos'd to be here consider'd.

4thly. that the *Reason* mention'd in our *Rubrick* concerning the *Impossibility* of Christs *natural Body's* existing in *several places* at the *same time*, is no way invalidated by any of this *Authors* exceptions against it.

Now these being most of them founded upon the former mistaken Notion of the *Real presence* falsely imputed to us, will admit of a very short and plain consideration.

1st. He observes "That *Protestants*, but especially our *Treatise 1st.
§. xx. n. 1.
pag. 13.* English Divines generally confess the presence of our Saviour in the Eucharist to be an ineffable Mystery. Well, be it so; what will he hence infer? Why "this he conceives is said to be so in respect of something in "it *opposite* and *contradictory* to, and therefore in- "comprehensible and ineffable by *Humane Reason*. But supposing they should not think it so from being *Opposite* and *Contradictory* to, but because the manner how Christ herein communicates himself to us is *hid from*,
and

Bishop
TAYLOR'S
Polem. Disco.
of the Real
presence. Sect.
ii. pag. 231.

Ibid.

and above our Humane Reason; might not this be sufficient to make it still be called an *ineffable*, and *incomprehensible Mystery*? Whereas the other would make it rather plain and *comprehensible Nonsense*. 'Tis a strange Affection that some Men have got of late for *Contradictions*; they are so in love with them, that they have almost brought it to be the definition of a *Mystery*, to be the *Revelation* of something to be believ'd in *Opposition to Sense and Reason*. And what by their *Notions* and *Parallels*, have advanced no very commendable Character of Christianity; as if it were a *Religion* full of *Absurdities*; and as *Fisher* the Jesuit once told King *James 1st* with reference to this very Subject, *the rather to be believed because it is contrary to Reason*. But if this be indeed our Authors Notion of *Mysteries* (and the truth is *Transubstantiation* can be no other *Mystery*) we desire he will be pleased to confine it to his own *Church*, and not send it abroad into the World as ours too. We are perswaded, not only that our *Worship* must be a *reasonable Service*, but our *Faith* a *Reasonable Assent*. He who opposes the Authority of Holy Scriptures, "says Bishop *Taylor*, against manifest and certain *Reason*, do's neither understand himself nor them. *Reason* is the voice of God as well as *Revelation*, and what is opposite to the one, can no more be agreeable to the other, than God can be contrary to himself. And though, if the *Revelation* be clear and evident, we submit to it, because we are then sure it cannot be *contrary to Reason*, whatever it may appear to us; yet when the *contradiction* is manifest, as that a *natural Body* should be in more places than one at the same time, we are sure that interpretation of Holy Scripture can never be the right which would infer this, but especially when there is another, and much more reasonable,

nable, that do's not. And in this we are after all justified by one whose Authority I hope our *Author* will not question, even his own self; "If, *says he*, we are "certain there is a *contradiction*, then we are certain "there neither ~~is~~ nor can be a *contrary Revelation*; and "when any *Revelation*, tho' never so plain, is brought; "we are bound to interpret it so, as not to affirm a *certainly known impossibility*. And let him that sticks to this rule, interpret Christs words for *Transubstantiation* if he can.

Treatise 1st.
§. 29. pag. 21.

"But do not our own Authors sometimes say, that "notwithstanding all the difficulties brought against "*Transubstantiation*, yet if it can be shewn that God "has revealed it, they are ready to believe it? Perhaps some may have said this, because for that very Reason that there are so many *contradictions* in it, they are sure it cannot be shewn that God has revealed it. But if he means, as he seems to insinuate, that notwithstanding such *plain contradictions* as they charge it with, they thought it possible nevertheless, that God might have revealed it, and upon that supposition, they were ready to believe it; I answer from his own words, that their supposal then was *Absurd and impossible*; since he himself assure us, that "None can believe a thing true, upon *what motive soever*, which "he first knows to be certainly *false*, or which is all "one, certainly to *contradict*. For these we say are "not verifiable by a *divine Power*; and Ergo, here I "may say, should a divine power declare a truth, it "would transcend its self. Which last words if they signify any thing and do not *transcend Sense*, must suppose it impossible for such a thing as *implies a certain Contradiction*, to be revealed.

Treatise 1st.
§. XX. n. 3.
pag. 14.

II. *Observation*, But our Author goes on, "I conceive that any one thing that seemeth to us to include
"a

" a Perfect *Contradiction*, can no more be effected by
 " divine Power than another, or than many others the
 " like may. Seeing then we admit that some seeming
 " *Contradictions* to Reason may be verified by the Di-
 " vine power in this *Sacrament*, there is no reason to
 " deny but that this may be also as well as any other.

Now not to contend with him about words; whoever told our Author, that we allow'd that there was any thing in this *Sacrament*, as received by us, that seemed to us to include a *Perfect Contradiction*? *Perfect Contradictions* we confess are all of them equally verifiable by a divine Power, that is, are all of them impossible. And for this we have his own word before. Now if there be any such things as *perfect contradictions* to be known by us, that which seems to us to be a *perfect contradiction*, must really be a *perfect contradiction*; unless *contradictions* are to be discover'd some other way than by seeming to our Reason to be so. And such it not only seems, but undoubtedly is, for the same *One, natural, finite Body*, to be in more places than one at the same time; if to be and not to be, be still the measure of *Contradictions*. He that says of such a *Body*, that it is in *Heaven* and on *Earth*, at *London* and *Rome*, at the same time, says in Effect that 'tis one and not one; finite and not finite; in one place and not in one place, &c. All which are such seemingly *perfect contradictions*, that I fear 'twill be a hard matter to find out any Power by which they can be verify'd.

Treatise 1st.

§. xxii. p. 15.

III. *Observation*, He observes Thirdly; " That those
 " who affirm a *Real and Substantial presence* of the very
 " *Body* of Christ to the worthy communicant, contra-
 " distinct to any such other *Real presence* of Christ's Bo-
 " dy, as implies only a presence of it in *Virtue*, and *Spiri-
 " tual Effects*, &c. must hold this particular seeming *Con-
 " tradition* to be *True*, or some other equivalent to it.

If

If by the *Real Presence* of the *very Body of Christ*, he means, as he before explains it, That Christ's *Natural Body*, that *very Body which is now in Heaven*, should be also at the same time here upon Earth; it is, I think, necessary for those who will affirm this, to hold some such kind of *Contradiction*, as he says: And 'tis for that very *Reason*, I am persuaded, he will find but few such Persons in the *Church of England*; which so expressly declares, that Christ's *Natural Body* is in *Heaven*, and not here, upon this very account, "*That it is contrary to the truth of a Natural Body to be in more places than one at the same time.*" However, if any such there be, as they herein depart from the *Doctrine* of their *Church*, so it is not our concern to answer for their *Contradictions*.

IV. He observes, lastly: "It seems to me that some of the more judicious amongst them (the *Divines* he means of the *Church of England*) have not laid so great a weight on this Philosophical Position, as wholly to support and regulate their Faith in this matter by it; as it stands in opposition not only to *Nature's*, but the *Divine Power*: because they pretend not any such certainty thereof, but that if any *Diving Revelation* of the contrary can be shewed, they profess a readiness to believe it.

Traet. 1. §. xxviii. p. 20.

I shall not now trouble my self with what some of our *Divines* may seem to him to have done in this matter; 'tis evident our *Church* has laid stress enough upon this *Contradiction*. Indeed where so many gross Repugnancies both to *Sense* and *Reason* are crowded together, as we have seen before there are in this *Point*, it ought not to be wondered if our *Divines* have not supported and regulated their

R

Faith

Faith *wholly* upon this one alone. We do not any of Us think it either safe or pious to be too nice in determining what God *can*, or *cannot* do; we leave that to the bold Inquisitiveness of their *Schools*. But this we think we may say, that if there are any unalterable Laws of Nature, by which we are to judg of these things; then God can no more make *one Body* to exist in *ten thousand places* at the *same time*, than he can make *one*, continuing *one*, to be *ten thousand*, than he can *divide* the same thing from *its self*, and yet continue it still *undivided*. And if any of our Divines have said, that they cannot admit that one Body can be in several places at once, "till the Papists can demonstrate the possibility thereof by Testimony of Holy Scripture, or the ancient Tradition of the Primitive Church, or by apparent Reason. We need not suppose that they said this, doubting whether it implied a *Contradiction*, but because the certainty of the *Contradiction* secured them against the possibility of any such Proof. *

* This is evident in B. Taylor, who thought

that God could not do this, because it implied a Contradiction: *Real Presence*, §. xi. n. 1. p. 230. and *Ibid*. n. 27. He saith 'tis utterly impossible. So also Dr. White professes, that according to the Order which God has fixed by his Word and Will, this cannot be done: *Conser.* pag. 446, 447. and before, pag. 181. to this Objection, That tho in Nature it be impossible, for one and the same Body to be in many places at once, yet because God is Omnipotent, he is able to effect it: We answer, says he, It implieth a *Contradiction*, that God should destroy the nature of a thing, the nature of the same thing remaining safe: See *more*, p. 180, 181. *White's Works*, Lond. 1624.

And now I know but one Objection more that is, or can be offered against what I have said, and which having answered, I shall close this Point: "For if this be all the *Church of England* understands, when it speaks of a *Real Presence*, viz. *A Real Sa-*

CRAMER-

ramental Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Signs, and a real Spiritual Presence in the inward Communion of them to the Soul of every worthy Receiver; will not this precipitate us into down-

right || *Zuinglianism*, and render us after all our pretences as very *Sacramentaries* as they? Indeed, I am not able directly to say whether it will or no, because I find the Opinion of *Zuinglius* very variously represented as to this matter. But yet, First,

If by *Zuinglianism* he means that which is more properly * *Socinianism*, viz. a *meer Commemoration*

of *Christ's Death*, and a *Thanksgiving to God for it*;

'tis evident it does not, forasmuch as we positively confess, that in this *Holy Sacrament*, there is a *Real*

and *Spiritual Grace* communicated to us, even all the

benefits of that *Death* and *Passion* which we there

set forth. And this, or somewhat very like it, I find

sometimes to have been maintained by † *Zuinglius*.

But now, Secondly, If by *Zuinglianism* he under-

stands such a *Real Presence*, as denies only the Co-

existence of *Christ's Natural Body* now in *Heaven*,

at the same time in this *Holy Sacrament*, but denies

nothing of that *Real* and *Spiritual*

* *Communion*, of it we have before

mentioned; this is indeed our *Do-*

ctrine, nor shall we be ashamed to

own it for any *ill Names* he is able

to put upon it. But yet I wonder

why he should call this *Zuinglia-*

ism; since if the common name

of *Catholick*, or *Christian Doctrine*, be not sufficient,

he might have found out a more ancient Abettor of

this *Real Presence*, than *Zuinglius*, and the truth is,

one of the most dangerous Opposers both of their

|| *See* 1. *Treatise*, pag. 23.
§. xxxii. p. 24.
§. xxxii. p. 25.
§. xxxvi,
xxxvii, &c.

* *Smalcus de*
Coen. Dom. p.
347. *Id Disp.*
9. de Hypocr.
p. 289.
Volkelius lib.
iv. cap. 12. p.
304, 319, &c.
Socius in Pa-
raneis, c. iv.
Selichingius
disp. de Coen.
Dom. p. 701.
† *Zuingl. See*
de Provid. Dei,
cap. 6, &c.

* *And this our Author seems to insinuate: See the places above cited: And indeed others have alledged this as the true Opinion of Zuinglius: See Calvin, Tract. de Coen. Dom. Defens. Sacram. Admonit. ad Westphal. & Passim. a. libi. Vid. insuper lib. de Orthod. Confess. c. 7. And especially Hospin. p. 42, 55, 177, &c. Hist. Sacr. part 2.*

Of the Real Presence acknowledged

Head and their *Faith* that ever was ; I mean *St. Paul*, who has not only clearly exprefs'd himself against them, as to this Point of the *Eucharist*, 1 Cor. x. 16. but in most of their other Errors left such pernicious Sayings to the World; as all their *Authority* and *Infallibility*, let me add, nor all their *Anathemas* neither, will not be able to overcome.

Vid. Cofens
Hist. Transub-
stantionis, cap.
v. §. 5. P. 57.

I shall close up this Discourse of the *Real Presence* acknowledged by us in this Holy *Sacrament*, with a plain familiar Example, and which may serve at once both to illustrate, and confirm the Propriety of it. A Father makes his last *Will*, and by it bequeaths his *Estate* and all the Profits of it to his *Child*. He delivers it into the Hands of his *Son*, and bids him take there his *House* and *Lands*, which by this his last *Will* he delivers to him. The *Son* in this case receives nothing but a *Roll of Parchment*, with a *Seal* tied to it from his *Father* ; but yet by virtue of this *Parchment* he is intituled to his *Estate*, performing the Conditions of his *Will*, and to all the Benefits and Advantages of it : And in that *Deed* he truly and effectually received the very *House* and *Lands* that were thereby conveyed to him. Our Saviour Christ in like manner, being now about to leave the World, gives this *Holy Sacrament*, as his final *Bequest* to us ; in it he conveys to us a right to his *Body* and *Blood*, and to all the *Spiritual Blessings* and *Graces* that proceed from them. So that as often as we receive this *Holy Eucharist*, as we ought to do, we receive indeed nothing but a little *Bread* and *Wine* into our *Hands* ; but by the *Blessing* and *Promise* of Christ, we by that *Bread* and *Wine*, as really and truly become *Partakers* of Christ's *Body* and *Blood*, as the *Son* by the *Will* of his

his *Father* was made *Inheritor* of his *Estate* : Nor is it any more necessary for this, that *Christ's Body* should come down from *Heaven*, or the outward Elements which we receive, be *substantially* turned into it, than it is necessary in that other case, that the very *Houses* and *Lands* should be given into the Hands of the *Son* to make a *real delivery* or *conveyance* of them; or the *Will* of the *Father* be *truly* and *properly* changed into the very *Nature* and *Substance* of them.

PART.

PART II.

CHAPTER III.

Of the Adoration of the Host, as prescribed and practised in the Church of Rome.

WE are now arrived at the last Part of this *Discourse*; in which I must thus far change the *Method* I pursued in the Other Subject, as to consider,

First, What the *Doctrine* of the Church of England as to this Point is; and what our *Adversaries* Exceptions against it are.

Secondly, What is the *Doctrine* of the Church of Rome; and whether what this *Author* has said in favour of it, may be sufficient to warrant their *Practice* as to this Matter.

*Rubr. at the
end of the
Communion.*

For the former of these, *The Doctrine of the Church of England*, we shall need go no farther than the *Rubrick* we have before-mention'd; wherein it is expressly declared, with reference to this Holy Sacrament, "That no *Adoration* is intended, or "ought to be done, either to the Sacramental Bread "and *Wine* there *bodily* received, or to any *Corporal* "*Presence* of Christ's *Body* and *Blood*: For that the
" Sacra-

“Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their
 “very *Natural Substances*, and therefore may not be
 “adored, (for that were *Idolatry* to be abhorred of
 “all Faithful Christians) and the *natural Body* and
 “*Blood* of our Saviour Christ, are in *Heaven* and
 “not *here*; it being against the truth of Christ’s
 “*natural Body*, to be at *One time* in *more places* than
 “*One*.

This then being sufficiently cleared, let us see
 what this *Author* has to *observe* against it.

1. “He supposes that we will grant, that if there ^{Treatise 1.}
 “were a *Corporeal Presence* of Christ’s *Natural Body* ^{Ch. 4. §. 39.}
 “in this Holy *Sacrament*, then *Kneeling* and *Adoration* ^{p. 27.}
 “would be here also due upon such an Account.
 He means, that were Christ himself here in his *Bo-*
dy actually present, He ought to be *adored*; and this
 he need not doubt of our readiness to grant.

2. “Tho the *Corporeal Presence* of Christ’s *Body*, ^{Ib. §. xl.}
 “*i. e.* of its being there *ad modum Corporis*, or clo-
 “thed with the ordinary Properties of a *Body*, be de-
 “ny’d; as it is, not only by the *English* Divines,
 “but by the *Lutheran* and *Roman*: Yet let there be
 “any other manner of *Presence* (known from Di-
 “vine *Revelation*) of the very same *Body* and
 “*Blood*; and this as *Real* and *Essential*, as if *Corpo-*
 “*real*; and then I do not see but that *Adoration* will
 “be no less due to it *thus*, than *so*, Present.

Now to this I shall at present only say, That the
Supposition being *absurd*, do’s not admit of a *rational*
 Consideration. Those who deny a *bodily Presence*
 of Christ’s *Body* in the Eucharist, and ask whether
Adoration may not be paid to his *Body*, which is con-
 fess’d not to be *bodily present* there, supposing it to
 be there some other way; ought to have no other
 satisf-

atisfaction than this, that they suppose an Impossibility, a thing which cannot be; and therefore concerning which no reasonable Answer can be given. Some I know have been more free, and allowing for the unreasonableness of the *Supposal*, have resolved contrary to our Author: But I think it very needless to dispute of the Affections of a *Chimera*; and wrangle about Notions that have neither Use nor Existence.

Treatise I.
p. 28. §. xli.

Ibid.

Treatise I.
§. xlii. p. 28.

3. He *observes*, lastly, "That the *Church* of *England* hath believed and affirmed such a *Presence* " (he means of *Christ's* Body in the *Eucharist*) to " which they thought *Adoration* due. I presume it was then in the Times of *Popery*; for since the *Reformation*, I have shewn before, that she has always held the contrary. But our Author will prove it, and that since the *Reformation*; " For, he says, he " has in his time met with no less than five of our " Writers, and those of no mean Account neither, " that have been of this Opinion. This indeed is a very notable way of proving the *Doctrine* of our *Church*: But what now if I should bring him *fifteen Others* that have deny'd it; then I hope the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England* may be as fair for the contrary. But we will examine his Evidence.

First; " *Bishop Andrews*, he says, declares, that " tho we *adore* not the *Sacrament*, yet we *adore Christ* " in and with the *Sacrament*, besides and without the " *Sacrament*: and assures the World, that *K. James* " looked upon *Christ* to be *truly present*, and *truly* " to be *adored* in it. How this *Bishop* thought *Christ* *truly present* in the *Sacrament* we have seen before; and may from thence easily conclude how he supposed he might be *adored* there: *viz.* As in all other

Holy

Holy Offices, in which we confess Him by his *Divine Power* to be *present* with us, but especially in this *Sacred Mystery*. And thus we all *adore* him, both in and with, and without the *Sacrament*; we confess him to be *truly present*, and therefore *truly* to be *adored* by us. But now for *Christ's Natural Body*, (of which, and not of *Christ himself*, our Dispute is) if that be any otherwise *truly present* than as we before shew'd, let it be remembred, that according to this *Bishop*, it must not be his *Glorified Body*, his *Body* as it now is; but his *Body Crucified*, his *Body as offer'd for us*, and in the *State of his Death*; so He expressly affirms; and this I believe our *Author* himself will confess in his sense to be impossible.

See above.

His next Witness is *Bishop Taylor*: "We *worship*, Treatise 1. §. xliii. p. 28.
 "He means, says this *Author*, the *Body*, or the *Flesh* of *Christ* [in the *Eucharist*]. But is he sure the *Bishop* meant so? If he be, I am sure the *Bishop* thought we all of us committed *Idolatry* in so doing. For being consulted, as we have seen above, "whether without all danger of *Idolatry* we may not
 "render *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour* as See Polemical Discourses §. Letter, at the end, p.
 "present in the *Blessed Sacrament* or *Host*, according to his *Humane Nature* in that *Host*? He expressly declares, "We may not render *Divine Worship* to Him as present in the *Blessed Sacrament*,
 "according to his *Humane Nature*, without danger of *Idolatry*, because he is not there according to his *Humane Nature*; and therefore you give *Divine Worship* to a *Non Ens*, which must needs be *Idolatry*. And indeed this our *Author* knew very well was his Opinion, who himself in his next *Treatise*, cites the *xiiith* Section of his *Real Presence*, Treatise 2. p. 9. §. vi. n. 2.
 which was written on purpose to prove the unlawful-

fulness of worshipping Christ's Body in this Sacrament. But *dissimulation* of other Mens Opinions in matter of Religion, is perhaps as lawful on some Occasions, as if it were their own: And why may not an *Author* prevaricate the *Doctrine* of his *Adversary* in defence of the *Catholick Faith*, since I have read of a * *Protestant Minister*, who in the Troubles of *France* being brought over to the King's Interest, was secretly reconciled to the *Church of Rome*, and permitted so far to dissemble his own Opinion, as not only to continue in the outward profession of the *Protestant Religion*, but even to exercise the Functions of his *Ministry* as before; and that by the express leave of his *Holiness*, for three whole Years, the better to carry on the *Catholick Cause* in betraying the Secrets, and managing the Debates of his Brethren.

* The Story was published in the *Memoirs of Monsieur D'ageant*, printed with permission at Grenoble, 1668. pag. 245 I will set it down in his own words.

Il'y avoit deja quelque tems que D'ageant avoit gagné l'

un des Ministres de la Province de Languedoc, qui étoit des plus employez aux Affaires & menées de ceux de la R. P. R. & en l'Estime particuliere de Monsieur de Lesdiguiers. Il avoit meme secrettement moyenné sa Conversion; & obtenu un Bref de Rome, portant qu' en core qu' il eut esté receu au giron de l'Eglise, il luy étoit permis de continuer son Ministère durant 3 Ans, pourveu qu'en ses preches il ne dit rien de contraire à la creance de la vraye Eglise, & qu' il ne celebrât point la cene. Le Bref fût obtenu, afin que le Ministre pût estre continué dans les Emplois qu'il avoit, & decouvrir les menées qui se faisoient dans le Royaume.

As for Bishop *Forbes*, and the Arch-bishop of *Spalatto*, it is not to be wondred if Men that had entertained the Design of *reconciling all Parties*, were forced to strain sometimes a little farther than was fit for the doing of it. And for Mr. *Thorndyke*, we have seen that his Notion of the *Real Presence* was particular, and widely different both from theirs and ours; and therefore that we are not to answer for the Consequences of it. But however, to quit these

these just Exceptions against them: Will he himself allow every thing to be the *Doctrine* or not of the *Church of Rome*, which I shall bring him three of their *Authors* to affirm or deny? If he will, then *Transubstantiation* is not their *Doctrine*, for I have already quoted above twice three of their most Learned Men against it. To adore an *Unconsecrated Host* by mistake, is *Idolatry*; for so S. Thomas, Paludanus, Catharine, and others, assure us: To worship the *Host*, supposing their *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* false, a worse *Idolatry* than any Heathens were ever guilty of; so several of their Writers confess. But now if our Author will not allow this to be good arguing against them, with what reason do's he go about to urge it against us?

Secondly; We must in the next place consider what the *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome* as to this *Point* is; and whether what this *Author* has advanced in favour of it, may be sufficient to warrant their *practice* of this *Adoration*.

For the *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*, I find it thus clearly set down by the *Council of Trent*: Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. cap. 5. "There can be no doubt, but that all the Faithful of Christ, after the manner that has ever been received in the *Catholick Church*, ought to give that *Supreme Worship* which is due to the true God, to his *Holy Sacrament*. For it is nevertheless to be adored, because it was instituted by our Lord

P. 57. Nullus itaq; dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto Latræ cultum, qui Vero deo Debetur, huic Sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Neq; enim ideo minus est Adorandum quodd fuerit à Christo D. ut sumatur institutum: Nam illum eundem Deum præsentem IN EO adesse. Credimus, quem Pater æternus introducens in Orbem Terrarum, dicit; Et adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei. Hebr. I.

“Christ that it might be *received*; Forasmuch as
 “we believe the *same God* to be present *in it*, of
 “whom the Eternal Father when he brought him
 “into the World, said, *And let all the Angels of God*
 “*worship him*. That therefore, according to this
 Council is to be *worshipped*, which Christ *instituted* to
 be *received*; and *in which* they believe Christ to be
 present: But 'tis no other than the *Holy Sacrament*,
 as these Trent-Fathers here expressly and properly
 stile it; which we all confess Christ *instituted* to be
 received, and *in which* they suppose Christ to be pre-
 sent: And therefore 'tis the *Sacrament* which is to
 be *adored*. Which reasoning I find Card. Pallavicini
 thus improving in his History of this Council: “It
 “is well known, *says he*, that to make a *Whole Ado-*
 “*rable* with the *Supreme Adoration*, it is sufficient
 “that *One part* of that *Whole* merits such a *Wor-*
 “*ship*. This he illustrates in the Example of
 Christ's *Humanity*; and thence concludes, “How-
 “then ought we not in like manner to *adore* this Sa-
 “*crament* which is a *Whole*, that contains as its prin-
 “cipal part *the Body of Christ*?

Card. Pallavi-
 cino Istoria
 del Concilio
 di Trento:
 parte seconda,
 l. 12. c. 7. pag.
 298.
 Ora è notissi-
 mo, che, ac-
 ciò che un Tut-
 to s'adori con
 adorazione di
 Latria, basta
 che una parte
 di quel tutto meriti questo culto. — Come dunque non douremo parimente adorare
 questo Sacramento, il quale è un Tutto che contiene come parte principale il Corpo di
 Christo.

It is therefore, as I conceive, the undoubted Do-
 ctrine of the Church of Rome, that the Holy Sacra-
 ment of the Eucharist, for the Reason here given, is
 to be *adored*, with that *Supreme Adoration that is due*
to the true God.

Now to warrant their *Practice* in this Matter, our
 Author thus proceeds in proof of it:

I. He

I. He premises some Propositions, which he calls, *Protestant Concessions*. Answer to his second Dis-
course.

II: Some others, which he styles, *Catholick Assertions*. And then,

III. Goes on to shew what warrant they have for that Belief on which this *Adoration* is founded.

I shall distinctly follow him in every one of these.

In his first Part, which he calls, *Protestant Con-* I. Part, *Protestant Concessions*.
cessions, I will go on with him thus far :

1st. * "That Supreme and Divine *Adoration* is" * §. I. pag. 1.
"due to our Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*."

2^{dly}, † "That where-ever the *Body* of our Lord † Ibid. §. II.
now is, there must also his *whole Person* be."

"And therefore, 3^{dly}, || That where-ever *Christ's* || Ibid. §. III.

"*Body* is truly and really present, there his *Divine*

"*Person* is supremely adorable."

But now for his next Assertion; * "That it is af- * §. V. n. 1. p. 2.

"firmed by many *Protestants*, especially those of

"the *Church of England*, that this *Body* and *Blood* of

"our Lord is really present, not only in *Virtue*, but

"in *Substance* in the *Eucharist*. † If he means, as in † See Treatise
his former *Treatise* he explain'd himself, that the ve- I. p. 5. §. 7.

ry natural *Body* of *Christ*, that *Body* that was born of

the *Virgin*, and crucified on the *Cross*, and is now in

Heaven, is also as to its *Substance* truly and really pre-

sent on *Earth* in the Holy *Eucharist*, or to the worthy

Receiver: I have in the foregoing *Chapter* fully

shewn this new *Fancy* to be neither the *Doctrine* of

the

the Church of England, nor the Opinion of those very Writers whom he produces for proof of it. And
 ¶ Disc. 2. p. 2. as to the || adoration of it upon any such account, I
 §. vi. n. 1. have just now declared his Mistake of them in that Point too. And I shall not follow our Author's ill Example in repeating it all over again.

For his * fifth Remark, "That the *Lutherans* affirm that *Christ's Body* and *Blood* are present, not "only to the worthy *Communicants*, but to the Con-
 "secrated Symbols; and whilst so present, which is
 "during the Action of the Lord's Supper (*i. e.* says
 "he, as I conceive them from the Consecration, till
 "the end of the Communion) are to be Adored. I
 answer; First, As to the former part, it is confess'd
 that the *Lutherans* do indeed suppose Christ to be
 present, not only to the worthy *Communicants*, but
 also to the *Consecrated Symbols*. But now, secondly,
 for the other part, that during the Action of the
 Lord's Supper, He is to be Adored there; this is not so
 certain. For, 1. I do not find any thing establish'd

* See below, amongst them as to this matter, neither in the Con-
 Disc. 2. p. 16. fession of *Auxpourg*, nor in any other publick Acts of
 † Conrad. their Church. 2. I find several of their Divines ut-
 Schluffelburg-terly denying, that *Christ's Body* is to be Adored in
 us, Catal. Hex- the Holy Sacrament; and our * Author himself con-
 ret. l. 3. arg. fesses it. Tho now, 3. † I will not deny but that
 45. p. 205. some others of them do allow, if not that *Christ's*
 Item Arg. 103. Body, yet that *Christ* himself is to be Adored after a
 p. 280. It. arg. peculiar manner in the Action of the Lord's Supper;
 174. p. 327. and as far as I conceive, do by the Action mean, as
 Francof. 1605. our Author here represents it, from the Consecration
 And Hospinian to the end of the Communion. So that then, with
 quotes it of Lu- this Limitation, his Proposition I presume may be
 ther himself, admitted; "That the *Lutherans* do acknowledg,
 that it was his Opinion, Con- "that
 cord. discor. p. 358. n. 16.
 Genev. 1678.

“that Christ is present during the Action of the
 “Lord’s Supper; and therefore it is by several of
 “them supposed, that he ought to be adored in it.

As to the sixth and last *Concession*, which he draws S. vi. p. 10, 11.
 from Monsieur Daille’s *Apologie* “That tho we do
 “not our selves belive the *Real Presence* of Christ’s
 “*Body* in the *Signs*, yet neither do we esteem the
 “belief of it so criminal, as to oblige us to break off
 “*Communion* with all those that hold it; and there-
 “fore, that had the *Roman Church* no other Error
 “but this, that it would not have given us any suffi-
 “cient cause of separation from it; we are ready
 to admit it; always supposing that the belief of it
 had not been press’d upon us neither, as a necessary
Article of Communion; nor any *Anathema* pronoun-
 ced against us for not receiving it. And for the o-
 ther part of it which he subjoyns, “That a Disciple Ibid. pag. 11.
 “giving Divine Honour, upon mistake, to another
 “Person, much resembling our Saviour Christ,
 “would have been no *Idolater*; from whence he
 would infer, “That therefore allowing a *Consecra-*
 “*ted Host* to be truly *Adorable*, a Person that should
 “by mistake adore an *unconsecrated One*, would not
 “be guilty of *Idolatry*. We are content to allow it;
 tho what use he can make of it in this *Controversy*,
 unless against his own Brethren, *S. Thomas, Paluda-*
nus, and others, I do not understand; since he knows
 we utterly deny any *Host, consecrated* or *not*, to be fit to
 be worshipped. And this may serve for his first *Founda-*
tion of Protestant Concessions; which were they
 every one as certain as his first is, that *Christ is to be*
adored, I cannot see what his Cause would gain by it;
 and he has not by any *Application* of them in this
Treatise, given us the least reason to think that they
 are

are of any moment in it. But some Men have a peculiar faculty of amusing the World with nothing : and I remember, I once heard a judicious and modest Man give this *Character* of an Author much resembling ours, with reference to his *Guide in Controversy*, that for a *Book* which carried a great appearance of *Reasoning*, it had the least in it of any he ever met with. But I go on,

2. Part.
Catholick Assertions.

II. To his *Catholick Assertions*.

And first : “ *Catholicks* (as he calls them) affirm
Pag. 13. §. ix. “ in the *Eucharist* after the *Consecration*, a *Sign*, or
“ *Symbol* to remain still distinct, and having a divers
“ *Existence* from that of the *thing signified*, or from
“ *Christ's Body* contained in or under it. This 'tis
true the *Papists*, or if you please, the *Catholicks* do
affirm ; because that otherwise they could not call it
a *Sacrament*. But now, if we enquire what that
which they call a *Sign*, or a *Symbol* in this Holy *Sacrament*
is, we shall find it to be neither such as our
Blessed Saviour establish'd, nor indeed any thing
that can in propriety of Speech be so termed.

For our Saviour Christ, 'tis evident that the *Symbols*
instituted by him, were *Bread* and *Wine* : They
were these that he took and blessed, and gave to his
Disciples ; and commanded them also in like manner
to take, and bless, and give to others in remembrance of
him ; and as the *Symbols* of his *Body* and *Blood* in
this *Holy Eucharist*. But now for the *Papists* ; they
destroy the *Bread* and the *Wine* ; they leave only a
few airy, empty *Species*, that is, appearances of
something, but which are really nothing, have no
substance to support them.

The

The *Symbols* establish'd by Christ were *Festival Symbols*, a matter apt for our *Corporal Nourishment*; so signify to us, that as by them, *viz.* by *Bread and Wine*, our *Bodies* are nourished to a *Corporal Life*; so by the *Body and Blood* of Christ, which they both represent and communicate to us, our *Souls* are fed to *Life Everlasting*. But for that which hath no *Substance*, *i. e.* nothing which can be converted into our *Bodily Nourishment*; how that can be a *Symbol* of this *Spiritual Food*, I do not very well understand. Indeed our Author tells us, "That tho after Consecration, the *Substance* of the *Bread and Wine* is deny'd to remain, yet is *Substance* here taken in such a sense, as that neither the *hardness*, nor the *softness*, nor the *frangibility*, nor the *savour*, nor the *odour*, nor the *nutritive virtue* of the *Bread*, nor nothing *visible* or *tangible*, or otherwise *perceptible* by any *Sense*, is involved in it: That is to say, that the *Symbol* or *external Sign* then in this *Eucharist*, is according to them, a *hard, soft, frangible, gustible, odoriferous, nutritive, visible, tangible, perceptible* nothing. Verily a fit *external Species* indeed to contain, a *one, manifold; visible, invisible; extended, unextended; local, illocal; absent, present; natural, supernatural; corporal, spiritual Body*. Pag. 14. S. x.

Secondly; Concerning the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament*, he tells us, "That this word *Sacrament*, is not to be taken always in the same sense; but sometimes to be used to signify only the *external Sign*, or *Symbols*; sometimes only the *Res Sacramenti*, or the thing contain'd under them, which is the more principal part thereof. This indeed is a sort of new *Divinity*. I always thought hitherto, that when we talked of a *Sacrament*, properly so called,

T

Catech. ad Pa-
rach. part 2.
de Sacram. n.
iii. & v. p. 92.

called, we had meant an *outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace*: and that this particular *Sacrament* had been a whole composed of the *External Species*, (whatever they are) as the *Sign*; and the *Body and Blood of Christ* as the *inward part, or thing signified*. Thus I am sure the *Catechism* of the *Council of Trent* instructs us. First, for the name; it tells us, that "*The Latin Doctors have thought that certain Signs, subjected to the Senses, which declare, and as it were set before the Eyes, the Grace which they effect, may fitly be called Sacraments.* And for the nature of them, thus it defines a *Sacrament* from *S. Austin*, "*It is the sign of a holy thing; or more fully, as I before said; a visible sign of an invisible Grace, instituted for our Justification.* So that neither then *Symbols* alone, nor the *invisible part, or Grace* alone, can with any manner of propriety be called a *Sacrament*; but the *Sign* referr'd to the *Grace*; and as it is the *Symbol* instituted by *Christ* for the conferring of it.

This therefore can with no good reason be called a *Catholic Assertion*; being neither *general* nor *true*: But however, since he seems content to allow it to be an *impropriety of Speech*, and that, I confess, the

* Catec. Conc.

Trid. part 2.

de Euch. §. viii.

nota p. 144.

† Pag. 15. §. xi.

* *Catechism* of the *Council of Trent* does lead him into it; let us see what use he can make of it. † "*And as Protestants much press, so Catholics (Roman Catholics) willingly acknowledg a great difference between these two, The worshipping of the Sacrament, as this word is taken for the Symbols; and the worshipping of Christ's Body in the Sacrament.* There is, no doubt, a great difference between these two: but then they who tell us, the *Sacrament* is to be *Adored*, if they will speak rationally, must

must mean neither the *one* nor *other* of these, but the *Host*; that is, as Card. Pallavicini expounds it, The *whole*, of which *Christ's Body* is a part; in the language of the *Council of Trent*; the *Sacrament* IN WHICH they believe *Christ* to be present, and for that Cause adore it; as the Cardinal again argues; * that, * See above, To make a *Whole* Adorable, it is sufficient that one part pag. 91, 92. be so; and therefore since the *Body of Christ* is adorable, the *Sacrament* for its sake is to be worshipped. It is therefore a meer shift to tell us that the *Sacrament* is to be adored; i. e. *Christ's Body* in the *Sacrament*. Nor will the remark of our Author help us out, that tho the *Chapter* indeed calls it the *Sacrament* IN Pag. 16 §. xiii. WHICH is *Christ's Body*, yet the *Canon* speaks more precisely, and calls it *Christ* in the *Sacrament*; unless he supposes the *Council* to have been infallible in the *Canons* only, and not in the *Chapters*; as some have thought, that they may be out in their *Proofs*, but cannot be in their *Conclusions*. But however, since he so much desires it, for my part I shall be content to allow them this too; for I should be glad by any means to see them sensible of their Errors. But yet so as that it be esteem'd only a *private Opinion* this, not a *Catholick Assertion*.

Thirdly; *Catholicks*, he means the *Papists* still, P. 21. §. xvii. "ground their *Adoration*, not upon *Transubstantiation*;" "on; as if *Transubstantiation* defeated, *Adoration* is" "so too; but on a *Real Presence* with the *Symbols*," "which in general is agreed on by the *Lutherans* together with them. By which Assertion, if he means only to make this Discovery, That *Christ's Real Presence*, together with the *Substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, is in his Opinion as good a ground for *Adoration*, as if he were there only with the

Of the Adoration of the Host,

Species of the Bread, the *Substance* being changed into his *Body*; I have no more to say to it. But if he would hereby make us believe, that 'tis all one whether Christ be *adored*, as supposed here by the *Lutherans* in this Holy *Eucharist*, and as imagined there by the *Papists*; I must then deny his *Affertion*; and desire him to keep home to his own *manner of Real Presence*, and which I shall presently convince him, will leave them in a much worse condition than their Neighbours, whom he would draw into the same Snare with them. And therefore, whereas he concludes,

P. 22. §. xviii. Fourthly; "That supposing *Transubstantiation* to be an *Error*, yet if the Tenent of *Corporal* or *Real Presence* (as held by the *Lutherans*, or others) be true; *Catholicks* (he would say *Papists*) plead their *Adoration*, is no way frustrated, but still warrantable: I must tell him, that the *Adoration* of those among the *Lutherans*, who worship Christ in this Sacrament upon the account of his *Real Presence* in, or with the Bread, tho it be an Error, yet is infinitely more excusable than theirs, who suppose the Bread to be turned into Christ's *Body*; and because it may not be thought that I speak this out of any prejudice against them, I will here offer my Reasons for it.

1st, They that *adore* Christ as *really present*, together with the Bread, do no violence to their *Senses*: They confess, that what they *see*, and *taste*, and *feel*, and *smell*, is *really Bread* and *Wine*. Whilst the *Papist* in denying the Bread and *Wine* to remain; or that what he *sees*, and *feels*, and *smells*, and *tastes*, is what all the World perceives and knows it is, contradicts his *Senses*, and in them the *Law of Nature*,
that

that Means which God has given us to *direct* and lead us into the search of *Truth*; and by Consequence errs against infinitely greater Means of *Conviction*, and so is more inexcusable than the Other.

2dly; They who worship Christ, as supposing Him to be together with the *Bread* in this *Holy Eucharist*, are erroneous indeed in this, that they take Christ's *Body* to be where really it is not; but yet their Object is undoubtedly right, and in that they are not mistaken. But now for the *Papist*; he *adores*, 'tis confess'd, what he thinks to be Christ's *Body*; and would not otherwise *adore* it: But yet still 'tis the *Host* that he *adores*, the Substance that is under those *Species* which he sees; and which if it be not Christ, but meer *Substance* of *Bread*, the Case is vastly alter'd between the *Lutheran* and *Him*. The former *adores Christ*, only as in a place where he is not; the latter not only do's this, but moreover *adores a Substance* for Christ which is not his *Body* and *Blood*, but a meer *Creature* of *Bread* and *Wine*.

Monfieur Daille therefore might rightly enough say of a *Lutheran*, "that his *Adoration* is mistaken, P.23. §.xix.
 "not in this—that it addresseth it self to an *Object*
 "not *adorable*, but only that by Error it seeks and
 "thinks to enjoy it in a place where it is not; and so
 "becomes only *vain* and *unprofitable*: And yet our Author has no manner of Reason from thence to pretend, that a *Papist* who terminates his *Adoration* upon a *Substance* which *really* is not Christ's *Body*, but only mistaken by him to be so, shall be in the same Condition: there being an apparently vast difference between worshipping Christ in a place where he is not, and worshipping that for Christ which really

really is not Christ, but only a created *Substance*.

Ibid p. 23. And this in truth our Author seems to have been sensible of, and therefore thinks to evade it, by saying, "That they do not worship the *Substance* that is in that place, under such *Accidents* whatever it be, (which if *Bread* should happen to be there, he confesses would make them *Bread-worshippers*) but they worship it only upon *supposition* that it is Christ's *Body*, and not *Bread*."

Well, be this so: But what now if they are mistaken in their *Supposition*? They worship, he confesses, the *Substance* that is under those *Accidents*, supposing it to be Christ's *Body*; but still, mistaken or not, that *Substance* which is under those *Species*, whatever it be, they do worship: And if they have, as he thinks, a *rational ground* for this *Supposition*, which we shall see by and by, yet this will only excuse them from being *formal Idolaters*; but will not hinder but that their Worship is still directed to an *undue Object*, if that which is under the *Species* be indeed but *Bread*, and not Christ's *Body* as they imagine. And this then may serve to argue the falseness of what he lays down as his

P. 22. §. XIX. Fifth, *Catholick Assertion*: "That supposing both the *Lutherans* and *Papists* mistaken in their Opinion, yet there can be no pretence why the One should not be as excusable as the others. Since as I have said; 1st, They err more grossly in abandoning the conviction of their *Senses*, which the *Lutherans* do not; 2^{dly}, They worship a *Substance* for *Christ*, which really is not: To which if this be not enough, I will add yet two other Reasons: 3^{dly}, That they make the *Consecration*, without which

which Christ is not present upon their own Principles, to depend on such uncertainties (as I shall more fully shew anon) that they can never be sure that Christ is there, which the *Lutherans* are free from: And lastly; They *Anathematize* those who dissent from them as to this *Point*, and so make a *Schism* in dividing the *Unity of the Church*, which the *Lutherans* are so far from doing, that they neither establish any Doctrine of *Adoration* at all, nay many of them do not believe it; and upon occasion, freely *communicate* with those who dissent from them in their belief, both of their way of the *Real Presence*, and of the *Adoration*. And for the same reason I cannot totally assent to his

Sixth Assertion: "That supposing there be no *P. 25. §.xxi.*
 "such *Real Presence* as either of them believes, yet
 "that their *adoration* of Christ, who is a true *Object*
 "of *Supreme Adoration*, and only by them mistaken
 "to be in some *place* where He is not, cannot be
 "termed any such *Idolatry*, as is the *worshipping* of
 "an *Object* not at all *adorable*."

This as to what concerns those of the *Lutherans* who adore Christ in the Sacrament, is true: But for the *Papist* it is not. He intends, I allow it, to worship Christ, but he mistakes an *Object* for *Christ*, which is only a piece of *Bread*. He worships his *Host*, supposing it to be our *Saviour's Body*, but his Error is gross, and he not only mistakes Christ to be in a place where he is not, but he mistakes that to be Christ which indeed is not, but only a *simple Wafer*. His Worship therefore is not like the *Manichees* worshipping of Christ in the *Sun*; but rather as if the *Manichee* should, from some mistaken grounds, have fancy'd the *Sun* it self to be turned into

Of the Adoration of the Host,

into Christ's Body; and then in defiance of all *Scripture, Sense, and Reason*, should have fallen down before it; but with a *good Intention* not to adore the *Sun*, but the *Body* of our Blessed Lord under the *Species* or *Accidents* of the *Sun*. This is the true *Parallel*; only that herein still the *Manichee* would have been the more excusable of the two, by how much the *Sun* is a more likely Object to be mistaken for Christ's *glorified Body* than a *Morsel of Bread*; and less capable of being discovered by our *Senses* and *Examination* not to be so.

It remains then, that these *Lutherans* only adore Christ where he is not; the *Papists* not only do this, but more-over they adore that for Christ which *really is not*, but a meer created *Substance*. Both the One and the Other are Erroneous; but the *Papist's* Mistake, renders him at the least guilty of *material Idolatry*, whereas the *Lutherans* is only an undue Application of his Worship as to the *Place*, but right as to the *Person*. Let us see,

Seventhly: How far their Mistake will excuse them, in answer to his *seventh Assertion*: "That how-
 "ever a *Manichean* may be guilty of *Idolatry* for
 "worshipping Christ in the *Sun*; and an *Israelite*
 "for worshipping God as specially resident in the
 "*Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, because it is adoring a
 "Fancy of their own, without any *rational Ground*
 "or *Pretence* thereof; and however meerly a *good*
 "*Intention*, grounded upon a *culpable Ignorance*, can
 "excuse none from *Idolatry*, or any other Fault; yet
 "if *Catholicks*, (*i.e.* the pretended *Roman Catho-*
 "licks) can produce a *rational Ground* of their ap-
 "prehending Christ *present* in the *Eucharist*, tho
 "possibly mistaken in it, they are to be ex-
 "cused

P. 26. §. xxii.

“ excused from *Idolatry*. Which Proposal is so just, that I am very willing to allow it ; and shall be heartily glad that the *Grounds* of their *Mistake* may in the End prove to have been so *reasonable* as to excuse them. But then it must be remembered too, that he confesses if these *Grounds* be not *reasonable*, but as he says of the *Manichees*, their *adoring of the Host* be indeed an *adoring a Fancy* of their own without any *rational Ground* ; So that their ignorance in this Matter is culpable, then by their own allowance they are *Idolaters*.

This therefore brings me to the last Thing to be enquired into.

III. What *Grounds* they have for this *Adoration* ? and whether they be such as, should they be mistaken in it, will be sufficient to excuse them ?

And thus after a great deal of *Preamble*, but very little to the purpose, we are at last come to the main *Question*. I have already so largely shewn our Reasons against *Transubstantiation*, or that *Real Presence* on which this *Adoration* is built, that I shall not need to insist here. Yet because the stress of this *Controversy* depends principally on this last Part, I will,

1st, Examine the strength of those *Grounds* which this *Author* has offer'd, to warrant their *Adoration*.

2^{dly}, I will propose an Argument or two upon their own allowed *Principles* against it.

But before we proceed to these Points, we must yet have one touch more upon the old String: "For the *Lutherans*, he says, being allow'd to have such a plausible Ground or Motive for their Adoration, whereby they become Absolved by other Protestants from Idolatry, in adoring our Lord as present there, I see not why the Grounds of Roman *Catholicks* should be any whit less valued than theirs.

See Ibid.

In Answer to which, the Reader may please to remember, that I have before said, that we do not excuse those *Lutherans* who do this so much upon this Principle, that they have a more plausible Ground or Motive for their Adoration; but for this rather, that confessing the Substance of the Bread to remain, they do not mistake their Object, but pay their Adoration indeed to Christ, only supposing him to be there where in Truth he is not. But, 2dly, this Author is very much mistaken if he thinks the *Lutherans* have no better a Foundation for their Real Presence than the *Papists*. Indeed, were the difference no greater than between a *Con* and a *Trans*, it would, I confess, be hardly worth the while to contend about it. But when we come to the Point it self, we may observe these four Advantages, among many others of the *Lutherans* side. 1. They confess for the outward Elements, that they are really what they appear to be, Bread and Wine; and so they do no Violence to their Senses; which, as I have said, is a great aggravation against the *Papists*. 2. By this means they are at no defiance with all those Texts of Scripture where they are so often called Bread and Wine after Consecration: All which the *Papist* contradicts, but the *Lutheran* does not. 3. From the words of Christ,

Christ, *This is my Body*; we all of us confess may be inferr'd, that *Christ's Body* is in this Holy *Sacrament*: But whence do's the *Papist* infer the destruction of the *Substance* of the *Bread*; so that what is *taken*, and *blessed*, and *given*, is not *Bread*, but *Christ's Body* under the appearance of *Bread*? This is an Error which I am sure the Text gives no manner of colour to; and therefore our Author cannot with any reason pretend, as he do's, whether we consult the Text of Holy *Scripture*, or our own *Senses*, that they have as good grounds for their *Real Presence*, as the *Lutherans* have for theirs. To all which let me add, 4thly, that by *Transubstantiation* they destroy the very Nature of a *Sacrament*, by leaving no true external *Sign* or *Symbol*, and which is another unanswerable Argument against them, whilst the *Lutherans* acknowledging the *Substance* of the *Bread* to remain, do not destroy at all the Nature of this *Sacrament*, but retain the same *Sign* which our Blessed Lord established, and so have no Objection on this side neither to convict them.

But yet notwithstanding all this, "Do not some Pag. 26, 27.
 "of our Writers confess, that the *Papists* Interpretation is more rational than the *Lutherans*? I Answer; What certain *Protestants* may have said in Zeal for their own Opinions, and in particular *Hospinian* upon the account of his Master *Zuinglius*, I cannot tell: But sure I am, we are not bound to answer for all that any *Protestant* Author has said. And if these Reasons I have here given for the contrary are valid, they ought to be more regarded, than the ungrounded Assertions of a *Sacramentary* Historian.

Pag. 27.

Well, but still the "*Papist* do's not ground his "*Adoration* upon *Transubstantiation*, but on *Corporal Presence*; and so they must both be excused, or neither.

This is a fetch to very little purpose: For let me ask this Author; He confesses he founds his *Adoration* upon the *Corporal Presence*: Do's he believe the *Corporal Presence* in the way of *Transubstantiation* exclusive to all others, or no? If he do's, then 'tis evident that the *Corporal Presence* and *Transubstantiation*, must with him stand or fall together; and so if he adores on the account of the *Corporal Presence*, he do's it upon the account of *Transubstantiation*. If he do's not believe this, 'tis plain he is no *Papist*, nor submits to the *Authority* of the Church of Rome, which has defined the *Corporal Presence* to be after this particular manner, exclusive to all Others, and *Anathematized* all that dare to deny it.

Laying aside therefore this Comparison, and which in truth will do them but very little kindness: Pag. 27. S. XXIV. "Let us view more particularly what rational Grounds they have to exhibit for this their belief "of their *Corporal Presence* of Christ in the *Eucharist*, and of the *Adoration* of him upon that account.

Ibid.

I. Ground: And the first is *Divine Revelation*: For which our Author offers the two usual Instances, of the words of *Institution*, and the 6th Chapter of *S. John*; both which therefore I have at large discoursed on above; and I believe sufficiently shewn how false a Foundation these are of this belief.

* Pag. 27, 28.

But yet since our Author reminds us; * "That a-
gainst these no Argument taken from our Senses or
Reason

"Reason is valid : I will beg leave to remind him of his own Assertion too, * "That none can believe a thing true upon what Motive soever, that he knows certainly to be false, or which is all one, certainly ly to contradict——So that if our Reason then makes us certain of such a contradiction, we may be certain that there neither is nor can be a contrary Revelation ; and when any Revelation, tho NEVER SO PLAIN, is brought, we are bound to interpret it so, as not to affirm a certainly known impossibility.

* See Treatise
1. P. 14.

P. 21. Treat. 1.

From which Principle it seems to me to follow, that were *Hoc est Corpus meum*, as evident a proof of Transubstantiation, as their own Authors confess it is not ; yet if our Sense and Reason tell us that there are certain Contradictions against the common Principles of Nature, and the universal Sentiments of all Mankind, no otherwise to be avoided but by taking those words in the sense in which we do ; we are then BOUND to interpret them so, as to avoid these Impossibilities. And this I am confident I have at large shewn above to be the Case, and thither I refer the Reader.

II. Ground. Their second Ground is founded upon the Authority of those Councils that have determined this Matter ; "The Declaration, as he calls it, of the most Supreme and Universal Church-Authority that hath been assembled in former Times for the decision of this Controversy, long before the birth of Protestantism.

P. 28. §. xxv.

These are great Words indeed ; but I wonder who ever heard before that a few miserable * Synods of particular Prelats, such as are all those to which he refers us, assembled against Berengarius, were the most

* These are his Synods ; at Rome, Vercelles, Tours & Rome again, An. 1059. and again, An. 1078.

Of the Adoration of the Host,

most supream and universal Church-Authority. For his little Reflection, that they were assembled long before the birth of *Protestantism*, I must tell him, I doubt he is mistaken. The Religion of *Protestants*, like that of *Papists*, is compos'd of two great parts; *Catholick Christianity*, common in some measure to us all; and *Protestations against Popery*. Now 'tis true, for what concerns the latter of these, we allow *Popery* to have the advantage of us, as to the Point of *Antiquity*, nor are we ashamed to own it: It being necessary that they should have fallen into *Errors*, before we could *protest* against them; but as to the present matter, our Author in his * *Guide*, to which he refers us, confesses that *Berengarius*, against whom these little *Synods* were called, proceeded upon *Protestant Grounds*, i. e. in effect was a *Protestant* as to this Point: And therefore 'tis false in him now to say, that these Councils were assembled long before the birth of *Protestantism*.

* Disc. i. p. 55.
§. lviii.

But I return to his Church Authority; and answer; 1. If this Doctrine be certainly contrary to *Sense* and *Reason*, as was before said, then he has told us before, that "*no Motive whatever, no Revelation, tho never so plain, can be sufficient to engage us to believe it.*" 2. For his *Councils*, the eldest of them was above a thousand Years after Christ, when by our own Confession, the Error, tho not of *Transubstantiation*, yet of the *Corporal Presence*, was creeping into the Church. 3. These *Councils* were themselves a *Party* against *Berengarius*, and therefore no wonder if they condemned him. 4. They were neither *universal* of the whole Church, or even of the *Western Patriarchate* in which they assembled; and therefore we can have no security that they did not err,

err, tho we should grant this Priviledg to a truly General Council that it could not. 5. 'Tis evident that some of them did err; forasmuch as the very * *Formularies* of Recantation prescribed to Berengarius, do not agree the one with the other; and one of them was such, that their own † Authors tell us it must be very favourably interpreted, or it will lead us into a worser Error than that which it condemn'd. 6. Were they never so infallible, yet they none of them defined *Transubstantiation*, but only a *Corporal Presence*; and so whatever Authority they have, it is for the Lutherans, not the Papists. 7. And this their own Writers seem to own; forasmuch as none of them pretend to any definition of *Transubstantiation* before the Council of Lateran; and till which time they freely confess it was no Article of Faith.

* In the first Formulary prescribed him by P. Nicholas 2. in the Synod of Rome, 1059. He thus declares, Panem & Vinum quæ in altari ponuntur post consecrationem non solum Sacramentum sed etiam verum Corpus & Sanguinem, D. N. J. Christi esse; & sensualiter non solum SA-

CRAMENTO, sed in Veritate manibus Sacerdotum, tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri. The former Part of which Confession is Lutheran; the latter utterly deny'd by the C. of R. at this day. In the second Formulary prescribed him by Gregory viith, 1078. Confiteor Panem & Vinum ——— converti in veram ac propriam Carnem & Sanguinem J. C. D. N. Et post consecrationem esse verum Corpus Christi ——— non tantum per signum & virtutem Sacramenti, sed in proprietate naturæ, & veritate substantiæ. This speaks of a Conversion, but of what kind it says not; and Lombard and the other Schoolmen, to the very time of the Council of Lateran, were not agreed about it: and P. Gregory himself in his MS. Work upon St. Ma. knew not what to think of it. † Jo. Semeca ad Can. Ego Berengar. nor. ad Jus Canon. "Nisi sanè intelligas verba Berengarii in majorem incidet Hæresim quam ipse habuit; & ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas; nam de Christi Corpore partes non facimus. So Hervæus in 4. dist. qu. 1. art. 1. says, that to speak the more expressly against the Hereticks, he declined a little too much to the opposite side. Sa Ricardus de Media Villa in 4. dist. princip. 1. qu. 1. Berengarius fuerat infamatus quòd non credebatur Corpus Christi realiter contineri sub pane, ideo ad sui purgationem, per verba excessiva contrarium Assertit.

Such is the Church Authority which this Discourser would put upon us. But now that I have mentioned the Council of Lateran, as I have before observed, that it was the same Council which establish'd

|| Lond. 1616.

Pag. 362, &c.

* Mr. Dodwel
Consid. of pre-
sent Concern-
ment, §. 31.

† Monsieur du
Pin utterly de-
nies these Ca-
nons to have
been the De-
crees of the
Council. Dis-
sert. vii. c. iii.
§. 4.

Pag. 28, 29.

§. XXV.

blish'd this Error, that also gave power to the *Pope* to *depose Princes*, and *absolve their Subjects from their Obedience*; so I cannot but remark further in this place, the *Zeal* of our *Author* in the *defence* of its *Authority*. It is but a very little while since another of their *Church*, || *Father Walsb*, in his Letter to the Bishop of *Lincoln*, did not think that the * *Learned Person* of our *Church*, to whom he refers us, had so clearly proved these *Canons* to have been the genuine † *Acts* either of the *Council*, or even of the *Papist* himself, but that a *Man* might still have reason to doubt of both: But indeed, tho' that *Father* be of another mould, yet there are still some in the *World*, and I believe of this *Author's* acquaintance, who like this *Council*, never the worse for such a *decision*; but think the third *Canon* as necessary to keep *Princes* in a due *Obedience* to the *Church*, as the first, *de Fide Catholica*, to help out the obscurity of the *Text* in favour of *Transubstantiation*.

But he goes on; and upon these *Premises*, "Ask us, What more *reasonable* or *secure* course in matters of *Religion* can a private and truly *hum-ble Christian* take, than where the sense of a *Divine Revelation* is disputed, to submit to that *Interpretation* thereof, which the *Supreme Authority* in the *Church*, that hath heretofore been convened about such matters hath so often, and always in the same manner decided to him, and so to act according to its *Injunction*?"

Now, not to say any more as to his *Expression* of the *Supreme Church Authority*, which it may be he will interpret not *absolutely*, but with this *Reserve*, that hath been convened about such matters; I answer from himself, 1. It is a more *reasonable* and *secure* course

course to follow that *Interpretation* which is agreeable to the *common Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind, and against which he tells us, not only the *Authority* of a *Synod*, but even a *Divine Revelation* is not sufficient to secure us. 2. These *Synods*, as I have shewed, besides that they were *particular*, were moreover *Parties* in the case. And then, 3. It is false to say that they always decided the *same*, or, that that which they decided is the *same* which the *Church of Rome* now holds in this matter. All which our * *Authors* have fully proved, and this *Discourser* therefore ought to have answered. * *Particularly Elondel, to whom this Author refers us, Eclairciss. de l'Euch. c. 20, &c. Albertinus de Euch. lib. 3. p. 947.*

III. *Ground*. "But now, *he says*, if these Councils be declined, as not being so ancient as some may expect; *i. e.* not held before some Controversy happen'd in the Church touching the Point they decided: They have yet another *very rational Ground* of their belief, and that is, the evident Testimony of the more Primitive Times. It would have been more to the purpose, if he could honestly have said of the *most Primitive Times*. But however his Modesty is the greater now, tho his Argument be not so strong. As to the Point of *Antiquity*, I have already fully discussed it above; and we are but very lately assured by one of their own *Authors*, that *Antiquity* is of our side in this Point. For the six or seven Fathers he has mentioned, || some of them are *spurious*; others have been † expressly answered by us; and all of them at large by Monsieur *Aubertine, Larrogue*, and others. If this does not

P. 29. §. XXVI.

Treatise of Transubstantiation, by an Author of the C. of R.

|| S. Ambrose de Sacramentis. Euseb. Emyssen. de Paschate. † Cyril Hierosol.

in the *Relat. of the Conference at my Lady T. 1676. in the Paper sent my Lady T. p. 50, 51, 52. And for S. Ambrose de Sacr. allowing the Book, yet see the Explication of what is there said, given by himself, p. 5. c. 4. See a late Treatise of the Doct. of the Trinity and Transubst. compared, Part 1. p. 46, 47.*

X

satisfy

* *Transubstantiation* no Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers. Cyrill's Authority examined, p. 13, 14. Ambrose's, p. 18, 19. Chrysostom's, p. 40. Greg. Nyssen's, p. 48.

satisfy him, he may shortly expect a fuller account in our own Language; * a *Specimen* of which has already been given to the World in Earnest of what is suddenly to follow.

IV. *Ground*. His next *Ground* is taken "from the universal Doctrine and Practice of the later both *Eastern* and *Western* Churches till *Luther's* Time, and at present also excepting his Followers.

To which I answer; That this *Ground* is not certainly true, and if it were, yet certainly 'tis nothing to the purpose. 1. It is not certainly true: Indeed, that the latter Ages of the *Western Churches* before *Luther*, that is, from the time of the Council of *Laterane*, did profess the belief of *Transubstantiation* is confess'd: And that a great part of the *Greek Church* at this day do's the same, since their new *Colledge* at *Rome*, and their *Money* and *Missionaries* sent among them have corrupted their Faith, I do not deny: But that this was so before *Luther* is not so certain; and whosoever shall impartially read over the long debate between the late *Monsieur Claude*, and *Monsieur Arnaud* concerning this matter, will, I believe, confess that this can be no rational *Ground* for their belief. *Ludolphus* tells us of the *Ethiopian*

Hist. Ethiop. l. 3. c. 5. n. 48.

Ibid.

* De Eccles. Græc. Stat. Hodiern. D. Smith, p. 116.

Lond. 1678. *Claude* Reponse au 2. Traite; liv. 3. c. 8. p. 434, &c. *Charenton*. 1668. Id. ult. resp. à *Quevilly* 1670. lib. 5. c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Histoire Critique* de la creance & des Coutumes, des Nations, du Levant. — Voyage du Mont Liban. Remarques, p. 302, 303, &c. *Larrogue* Hist. de l'Eucharistie, liv. 2. c. 19. pag. 791. Edit. Amst. 12°. *Albertinus* de Eucharistia, p. 988; 989. fol. *Daventriz* 1554.

those

those who please to interest their Curiosity in a matter of so little moment as to their Faith, may satisfy themselves in the Authors, to which I refer them. Tho now, 2. To allow the matter of Fact to be true, I pray, what force is there at last in this Argument, "The Church both Eastern & Western, in these last Ages have believed *Transubstantiation*; therefore the *Papists* have a *rational Ground* to believe it. That is to say, you *Protestants* charge us for believing *Transubstantiation*, as Men that act contrary to the design of Christ in this *Holy Eucharist*, that have forsaken the *Tradition* of the *Primitive Ages* of the Church; that destroy the nature of this *Holy Sacrament*, and do violence to the common *Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind: Be it so; yet at least we have this *rational Ground* for our belief, tho it should be false, *viz.* That we did all of us peaceably and quietly believe it, till you came with your *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, and *Sense*, and *Reason*, to raise Doubts and Difficulties about it; nay more, we all of us still do believe it, except those that you have perswaded not to do so.

Spectatum admissi risum teneatis Amici?

V. Ground. Of no greater strength is his last Ground for their belief, *viz.* "That since *Luther's* Time no small number of *Protestants*, even all the *Genuine Sons* of the Church of England, have proceeded thus far, as to confess a *Real Presence* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* in the *Eucharist*, and *Adoration* of it, as present there. For, 1. If we did *acknowledg* this, yet it seems we are mistaken in it; and then what grounds can it be for a *Papist* to believe

P. 31. §. xxviii.

believe *Transubstantiation*, that we *Hereticks* by a Mistake do not believe it, but only a *real spiritual Presence*, and as such are *Anathematized* by them for our Error? 2. I have before shewn, that were this a *rational Ground*, yet it fails them too; for neither do the *Genuine Sons* of the *Church of England*, nor any other that I know of, either believe *Christ's natural Body* to be substantially present in the *Holy Eucharist*, or to be adored there: I am sure if there be any such, they cannot be the *Genuine Sons* of the *Church of England* in this Matter, who believe so expressely contrary to her formal Declaration, as this Author has himself observed.

ibid. Pag. 32.

And then for the *Lutherans*, to whom he again returns; it is hard to conceive what *rational ground* of Security they can derive from their practice; that because they commit no *Idolatry* in worshipping what they know certainly to be *Christ*, the *Papist* commits none for worshipping what he do's not know certainly is *Christ*; in truth what, if he pleased, he might know certainly is not *Christ*.

And now after a serious and impartial Consideration of the Grounds produced in Vindication of this *Worship*; tho I could have wish'd I might have found them as *rational* as our Author pretends them to be, and shall be glad, as they are, that they may hereafter prove sufficient to excuse them from the Guilt of *formal Idolatry* in this *Adoration*; yet I must needs say, I do in my Conscience think 'tis more
 “an excess of *Charity*, than any necessity of Argument, if our *Writers* do sometimes, either not
 “at all, or but faintly, charge them with *Idolatry*.
 And the Testimonies he produces, argue rather the candor of our Affections towards them, even such

P. 33. §. XXX.

as

as to hope, almost against Hope for their sakes ; than give any security to them in their Errors. And because I would willingly, if possible, convince them of it, I will very briefly subjoin a Reason or two.

2dly ; Why even upon their own *Principles* I am not satisfied that they have such a *rational Ground* for this *Adoration*, as may be sufficient to excuse them.

For, 1st, It is granted by this Author, “ That a P.26. §.xxii.
“ merely *good Intention* grounded upon a *culpable Ignorance*, cannot excuse them from *Idolatry*. So that if their *ignorance* then be really *culpable*, their *good Intention* will not be sufficient to excuse them. Now the *ignorance* upon which this practice is founded, is their mistaken interpretation of those words, *This is my Body* ; and whether that be a *rational* or *culpable* Mistake, we shall best be able to judge by two or three Observations.

1. It is confess’d by the greatest Men of their Church, that there is *no necessity* to interpret those words in that manner that they do ; so that had not the Authority of their Church interposed, they might have been *equally verified* in our Interpretation. And this must be allow’d, unless we shall say, that all places of Holy Scripture must be understood in a *literal sense*, whatever the Consequence be of so doing.

2. Our Author himself confesses, that if the taking of them in the *literal sense* do’s involve a *certain Contradiction*, then it cannot be right ; but we are *bound* to seek out some other Exposition to avoid a *certain Contradiction*.

3. It

3. It is undeniable, that their Interpretation of these words destroys the certainty of *Sense*, and in that of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, which was confirmed by *Miracles*, known only by the evidence of *Sense*; and by Consequence of this particular Point, that *Transubstantiation* is revealed to us by God, or can be rely'd upon as coming from him.

Now from these Principles I thus argue: If that *sense* of these words, *This is my Body*, upon which they ground their *Adoration*, do's necessarily imply many plain and certain *Contradictions*, then by their own Confession that cannot be the right *sense* of them. But that it do's so, and that without gross and culpable *Ignorance* they cannot doubt of but know it, I thus shew. He that believes these words in the *sense* of *Transubstantiation*, must believe the same *natural Body*, at the same time, to be in ten thousand several places upon Earth, and yet still to be but *one Body*, and that all the while in Heaven: He must believe that the same *natural Body* is at the same time *extended* in all its Parts, and yet continuing still the *same Body* without any change; to be *unextended*, and have no distinct Parts, nor be capable of being divided into any: He must believe the same *Body* at the same time, to move, and to lie still: to be the Object of our *Senses*, and yet not to be perceptible by any: With infinite others of the like kind * as I have more fully shewn before. But now all these are gross *Contradictions*, contrary to the *Nature* of a *Body*, and to the common *Principles* of *Reason* in all Mankind; and no Man can, without culpable *Ignorance* pretend not to know them to be so: And therefore, notwithstanding any such supposed *Divine Revelation* as may be pretended from those words,

* See above,
Ch. 2. of *Transubstantiation*.
Pag. 32, 33.

words, *This is my Body*, they cannot, by our Author's own Rule, without *culpable Ignorance*, not know that they are mistaken in this Matter.

Again: No *Papist* can have any reason to believe *Transubstantiation* to be true, but because he reads those words of Holy Scripture, *This is my Body*. That these words are in Scripture, he can know only by his *Senses*: If his *Senses* therefore are not to be trusted, he is not sure there are any such words in Scripture. If they are to be trusted, he is then sure that the *Interpretation* which he puts upon them must be *false*.

Since then it is confess'd, that there is *no necessity* to understand those words in a *literal sense*; and that both upon the account of the *Contradictions* that such an Exposition involves to the *common Principles of Reason*, and to the certain *Evidence of the Senses of all Mankind*, it is necessary to take them in some other meaning, it remains that without gross and *culpable Ignorance* they cannot pretend not to know, that this could never have been the intention of our Blessed Saviour in those words; and that such *Ignorance* will not *excuse* them, our Author himself has freely confess'd.

But, 2dly, let us quit this Reflection, and for once suppose the possibility of *Transubstantiation*. Yet still it is confess'd by them: 1. That there is no Command nor Example in holy Scripture for *adoring* Christ in the *Eucharist*. 2. That infinite Defects may happen to hinder him from being there; and then what they *worship* is only a piece of *Bread*. 3. That they can never be sure that some of these *Defects* have not happened; and by consequence, that what they suppose to be *Christ's Body*, is indeed any more than a *meer Wafer*.

From

Of the Adoration of the Host,

From whence I argue ;

He that without any Command or Warrant of God, pays a *Divine Adoration* to that which he can never be sure is more than a *meer Creature*, can never be sure that he do's not commit *Idolatry* : But whosoever worships the *Host*, worships that which he can never be sure is more than a *meer Creature* ; and therefore he can never be sure that in so doing he do's not commit *Idolatry*.

Now concerning the former of these, how dangerous it is for any one to give *Divine Worship* to what he can never be sure is any more than a *meer Creature*, be it considered, what *jealousy* God has at all times express'd of his *Honour* as to this Matter ; how strict he has been in the peculiar vindication of his Supreme *Prerogative* in such Cases. How therefore he that will come to him, must be very well assured that it is God to whom he approaches ; and therefore if he has but the least reason to *doubt* of it, ought not to worship with a *doubting Mind* ; because he ought not to do that the *omitting* whereof can be no *fault*, but the *doing* of which may, for ought he knows, be a very great *Sin*.

And for the second ; Whether every *Roman Catholic*, who *adores* the *Host*, has not even upon his own *Principles*, very great cause to doubt, whether he *adores* Christ's *Body*, or only a bit of *Bread*, will appear from those infinite Defects which they themselves allow as sufficient to hinder a *Consecration* ; and which make it great odds, were their Doctrine otherwise never so true, whether yet one *Host* in twenty, it may be in five hundred, be consecrated.

I. With reference to the Holy *Elements* to be consecrated : If the *Bread* be not all, or at least the greater

ter part, of *Wheat-flower*; if it be not *mix'd* with *pure Water*; if the *Bread* be corrupted, or the *Wine* sour; if the *Grapes* of which the *Wine* was made were not *ripe*; if any thing be *mingled* with the *Wine* but *Water*; or if there be so much *Water* mix'd with it, that that becomes the prevailing Ingredient; in all these Cases, and many others which I omit, there is no *Consecration*. And of all this, he who *adores* either the *Bread* or *Wine*, can have no security. But,

See all this in the beginning of the Missal, de defectibus circa Missam.

2. Be the Elements right, yet if the Priest, being either ignorant, or in haste, or unmindful of what he is about, should by mistake, or otherwise, err in pronouncing of the words of *Consecration*; whether by *Addition*, or by *Diminution*, or by any other *Alteration*, there is no *Consecration*: The *Bread* and *Wine* continue what they were; and of this too he that worships them can never be certain.

3. Let the words be never so rightly pronounced, yet if the Priest had *no intention to consecrate*; if he be a secret *Atheist*, or *Jew*, or *Moor*: If he be a careless negligent Man; it may be do's not believe he has any Power to make such a Change, (as I have shewn that several of their greatest Men in this very *Age* have doubted of it): If he consecrate a number of *Wafers* for a *Communion*, and in his telling Mistakes, intending to consecrate but *twenty*, and there are *one and twenty* before him; in all these Cases, for want of a *due intention* in the Priest, there is no *Consecration*; but that which is *adored*, is only a little *Bread* and *Wine*.

4. Let the Priest have a good *Intention*, yet if he be *no Priest*; if he were not rightly Baptized, or Ordained; if he were a *Simoniac*, or *Irregular*, or

See above in the Preface.

Of the Adoration of the Host,

a Bastard, &c. Or if there were no defect in his *Ordination*, yet if there was any in his who *ordained* him; or in the *Bishops* that *ordained* that *Bishop* that *ordained* him; and so back to the very Time of the *Apostles*, if in the whole Succession of Priests to this day, there has been but any *one Invalidity*, whether by Error or Wilfulness, or for want of a due Intention, or by Ignorance, or by any other means; then he that *consecrates* is no true *Priest*, and by consequence has no Power to *consecrate*; and so all is spoiled, and whosoever *worships* in any of his *Masses*, *adores* only a piece of *Bread* instead of our Saviour's *Body*.

When therefore so many *Defects* may interpose upon their own Principles to hinder this *Conversion*, that 'tis exceeding probable, nay 'tis really great odds, that not one *Host* in twenty is consecrated; it must certainly be very hazardous to worship that for God, which upon their own *Principles* they can never be sure is so; nay, which 'tis twenty to one is not *God*, but a meer inanimate Creature of *Bread* and *Wine*.

* See *Billarm.*
de *Justif.* c. 8.

Page 23.

Ad. VI. quod
libet. Sect. 10.
Suppos. 2.

See *Gosn.*
Tract. de Ex-
am. doct.
censur. 6.

'Tis this has forced their most Learned Men to confess, that they can never be *sure* of a *Consecration*; and our Author himself to declare, "That they do not worship the Substance that is under the Accidents of *Bread* and *Wine*, *WHATEVER IT BE*, "but *UPON SUPPOSITION* that it is *CHRIST'S BODY*; Which is what Pope *Adrian 6th*, following herein the Authority of the Council of *Constance*, prescribed; that they ought always to *adore* the *Host* with such a reserve: "The Council of *Constance*, "says he, excuses those who in their simplicity *adore* "an *unconsecrated Host*, because this condition is tacitly

"citly implied, *if it be rightly consecrated* : And therefore he advises, let them so adore the Host, **I ADORE THEE IF THOU ART CHRIST**. But now if, as the Apostle tells us in another case, *Whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin* ; and, *He that doubts, is damned if he eats* : I shall leave it to any sober Christian to say what security there can be in such a *Worship*, which is neither advised, encouraged, or commanded in Holy Scripture ; and which they themselves confess they can never be certain is addressed to a right *Object* ; and therefore are forced to such Shifts and Reserves, as were they once admitted, might make any other Creature in the World as warrantably *adorable* as their *Host*.

How much better were it for them to *adore* their Blessed Saviour in *Heaven*, where his *glorified Body* most certainly is : Where there can therefore be no danger to *lift up our Hearts* unto him. Were his Sacred Body indeed *substantially present* in this Blessed Sacrament, yet still it would be in a manner to us imperceptible, in the state of his Death, and by consequence of his Humiliation ; and we might therefore have some cause to doubt whether, since we have received no Command concerning it, it were our Saviour's Pleasure that his *Body* should be *adored* by us in that State : So that there could be no Sin in the not doing of it. But now amidst so many Doubts, not only upon Ours, but even upon their own Principles, that they dare not themselves *worship at a venture*, that which yet they do *worship* ; tho I shall leave them to their own Master to stand or fall at the Great Day, yet I must needs profess I think there is very much hazard in it. A great Sincerity, and great Ignorance, may excuse a poor untaught, and therefore *blindly obedient* Multitude : but for their *Guides*, who lead them into Error, for those to whom

God has given Capacities and Opportunities (as to those now among us he has done, of being better informed) I can only say, *Lord, lay not this Sin to their Charge!*

Page 37.
§. xxxiii.

And this may suffice to have been said to the third Thing proposed, of their *Rational Grounds* for this Worship. For what our Author finally adds; "That
"to adore that which the Adorer believes not to be our
"Lord, but Bread, would be unlawful to be done by
"any, so long as the Person continues so persuaded—
"But then if we suppose the Church *justly* requiring
"such Adoration upon such a true Presence of our
"Lord, neither will the same Person be free from sin-
"ning greatly in his following such his Conscience, and
"in his not adoring.

I Answer: It will then be time enough to consider this, when either the Church to which we owe an *Obedience*, shall require it of us, or they be able to prove that in such a Case the Church would not *sin* in *Commanding*, and not *we* in *refusing* to obey her. But, blessed be God, there is no great danger of either of these: Our Church is too well persuaded of the unlawfulness of such a *Worship*, ever to require it of us. And for that Church which has so uncharitably undertaken to *Anathematize* all those who will not own her *Authority*, and receive her Errors, tho never so gross, as Articles of Faith: We are so fully convinced of the unreasonableness of her Pretences, and of our own Liberty, that we shall hardly be brought to submit our selves to the Conduct of such a *blind Guide*, lest we fall into the same *Ditch*, into which she her self is tumbled. And it would certainly much better become our Author, and his Brethren, to consider how they can justify their *Disobedience* to their own *Mother*, than to en-

endeavour at this rate to lead us into the same *Apostacy*, both to our *Religion* and our *Church* with them.

The Conclusion.

AND thus by the Blessing of God, and the Advantage of a good Cause, have I very briefly passed through this Author's *Reflections*, and I am perswaded sufficiently shewn the weakness and falsity of the most of them. If any one shall think that I ought to have insisted more largely upon some Points, he may please to know, that since by the importunate Provocations of those of the *other Communion*, we have been forced too often to interrupt those Duties of our *Ministry*, in which we could rather have wish'd to have employ'd our Time, for these kind of Controversies which serve so very little to any purposes, either of true Piety, or true Charity among us: We have resolved thus far at least to gratify both our selves and others, as to make our *Disputes* as *short* as is possible; and loose no more time in them, than the necessary Defence of our selves and the Truth do require.

I have indeed pass'd by much of our Author's *Discourses*, because they are almost intirely made up of tedious and endless *Repetitions* of the same things, and very often in the same words. But for any thing that is Argumentative, or otherwise material to the main Cause, I do not know that I have either let the Observation of it slip, or dissimble at all the Force of it.

It was once in my thoughts to have made some Reflections in the Close upon the *Changes* of their *Rituals*, in requital for our Author's Observations on the *Alterations* of our *Liturgie*; but I have insisted longer than

than I designed already, and shall therefore content my my self to have given the Hint of what might have been done, and shall still be done, if our Author, or any in his behalf desire it of me.

In the mean time I cannot but observe the unreasonable-ness of that *Method* which is here taken ; from the Expressions of some of our Divines, and the Concessions of others, whose profess'd Business it was to reconcile, if possible, all Parties, and therefore were forced sometimes to condescend more than was fit for the doing it ; and even these too miserably *mangled* and *misrepresented*, to pretend to prove the *Doctrine* of our Church contrary to the *express Declarations* of the *Publick Acts* and *Records* of it. This has been the endeavour of several of our late Writers, but of this *Discourser* above any. Had those worthy Persons, whose Memory they thus abuse, been yet living, they might have had an ample Confutation from their own Pens ; as, in the very Instance before us, has been given them for the like ill use made by some among them, of the pious *Meditations* of a most Excellent and Learned *Father* of our Church ; and who might otherwise in the next Age have been improved into a new Witness against us. I do not think that Bp *Taylor* ever thought he should have been set up as a favourer of *Popery*, who had written so expressly and warmly against it. Yet I cannot but observe a kind of Prophetick Expression in his Book of the *Real Presence*, which being so often quoted by these Men, I somewhat wonder it should have slipp'd their Remark : Where speaking of their Shifts to make any One they please of their side, he has these words ; " And—I know no reason, *says he*, but it may be possible, but a WITTY MAN may pretend, when I am dead, that in this

" *Dis-*

" *Discourse* I have pleaded for the *Doctrine* of the Roman Church.

We have now lived to see some of those WITTY MEN that have done but little less than this; tho how *Honest* they are in the mean time, I will not determine. But I hope this Design too shall be from henceforth in good measure frustrated: And therefore, since neither their *New Religion*, nor their *New Advocates* will do their Business; since it is in vain that they either *misrepresent* their own *Doctrine*, or our *Authors* in favour of it; may they once please either honestly to avow and defend their Faith, or honestly to confess that they cannot do it. Such shuffling as this, do's but more convince us of the *weakness* of their *Cause*; and instead of defending their *Religion* by these Practices, they only encrease in us our *ill Opinion* of that, and lessen that *good One* which we willingly would, but shall not always be able to conserve of *those*, who by such indirect means as these, endeavour to support it.

FINIS.

1534

Books lately printed for Richard Chiswell.

A Dissertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Bishops of Rome* upon other *Sus.*
By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Answer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [*Sure Footing in Christianity*] concerning the Rule of Faith: With some other Discourses. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D.D. 40.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Answer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

The *APÓLOGY* of the *Church of England*; and an Epistle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venitian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Bishop of *Salisbury*: Made English by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop: Collected and written by the same Hand. *Octavo.*

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Bishop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which passed betwixt him and *James Waddesworth* (a late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman* Obedience. *Octavo.*

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning some Opinions of the *Jesuits*, and other *Casuits*. *Quarto.*

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.* First and Second Parts.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [*A Papist Misrepresented and Represented*]. *Quarto.*

• An Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*]. *Quarto.*

• A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; against the Exceptions of Monsieur de *Maux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 40.

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Answer thereunto. By a Protestant of the *Church of England*. 80.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented, being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [*Papist Misrepresented and Represented*]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Christian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The Plain Man's Reply to the *Catholic Missionaries*. 240.

An Answer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholic Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Answer to *THREE PAPERS* concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholic Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

